

4257 g 10

A  
VINDICATION  
OF THE  
**Eternal Law,**  
AND  
Everlasting Gospel.

The FIRST PART.

WHEREIN  
The Continuation of the Law ; its high  
Demands ; the Incapacity of Man for obeying  
it, in his fallen State, are asserted and prov'd :  
The Suretiship of Christ ; His obeying and suf-  
fering in our stead ; are maintained and defend-  
ed : The Concernment of Faith in Justifica-  
tion, is open'd and explain'd.

TOGETHER  
With a SECOND PART of  
this VINDICATION.

By JOHN BEART, Pastor of a  
Church of CHRIST in *Bury, Suffolk.*

LONDON : Printed by R. Tookey for the Author ;  
and are to be sold by N. Hillier, at the *Prince's Arms* in  
*Leaden-Hall-Street.* MDCCVII.

VINDICATION  
OF THE

CRIMINAL LAW

AND  
THE PRACTICE OF THE COURTS

THE FIRST PART.



BY  
JAMES WILSON, Esq.

OF THE  
COURT OF COMMONS

LONDON:  
Printed by J. G. ALLEN, 10, Abchurch Lane, E.C. 4.



---

# THE PREFACE.

**W**HAT is that Righteousness wherein a Sinner may stand before God, pardoned and accepted unto eternal Life? Is a Question confessedly of the highest Importance and Concernment. That the Righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, fulfilled by Himself, here on Earth, in our Room and Stead, is that alone Righteousness, which answers all Charges of all Laws whatsoever, on the behalf of the Believer in Jesus; is the true Gospel-Answer to this Enquiry. In this all the Lines of this Treatise center; the Design whereof is the Establishment of those who have received this glorious Truth of the Gospel, and the Conviction of others. It is Matter of great Lamentation, that this should be the Subject of Dispute amongst Protestants, amongst Dissenters.

If Christ be own'd in his Work and Office of a Saviour, in Opposition to the Socinian Blasphemy, there are but these two ways supposable, in which he can be so: Either, that making Reparation for the Breach of the first Covenant, he hath procured a Remedial Law of lower Terms, condescending to our Weakness; that by Obedience thereto we might work out a justifying Righteousness our selves, intitling to Life and Happiness: Or else, that coming into our Place and Stead, he hath fulfilled, in our Room, a justifying Righteousness Himself, which to all Intents and Purposes, is made ours, for Justification before God, from all Condemnation. Here are the two ways: And how contrary these two are, That Christ hath procured by his Death an Abatement of the Law, that our O-

bedience should justify; *and on the other Hand*, That Christ hath altogether fulfill'd the Law, and that his Righteousness is imputed for Justification; *let those Believers judge, who have their Senses exercised to discern both Good and Evil. The bottom of the Controversy therefore is about the justifying Righteousness of a Sinner: Whether it is Christ's, or his own? At least, whether it is Christ's alone, or Christ's and his own? The One as answering the Penalty of the Law of Works; the Other as answering another Law, that is supposed to have a Charge against Men, till they have fulfill'd its Conditions. All other Arguings in this Controversy are but incident, and aim'd to establish one of these ways of Righteousness. And according as Men hold here, their whole Frame and System of Doctrine must be disposed, that there may be a Harmony in the Parts.*

*The New Methodists, with whom I have to do in this Part of this Vindication, do teach, as is ready to be justify'd from their Writings, at any time. (1.) That Christ, having satisfy'd for the Breach of the old Law of Works, hath procur'd and given a new Law, a Remedial Law, or Law of lower Terms than the old, suited to our fallen State, and accepting of sincere Obedience instead of that perfect Obedience, which the old Law required. This is the *Πρώτη Ἰδέα*, or Foundation-Falsity of their whole Doctrine. (2.) That the whole World is under the Law of Grace; and consequently that they who perish, do perish as Transgressors of the new Law, and under the Penalty thereof, tho' they are also left to the Condemnation of the Old, in not complying with the Grace held forth in the New. (3.) That Jesus Christ did not fulfill the Precept of the Law for us himself; but by his Death and Sufferings obtain'd that our Obedience should be accepted for a Gospel-Righteousness, and that therefore we are truly justify'd before God by Gospel-Works. (4.) That Christ dy'd to render the whole World*

World salvable, or to put them into a Capacity of being sav'd, by their fulfilling the Conditions of this new Law. (5.) That Faith and Repentance are not the Purchase of Christ for us, but given out of the Grace of Election. (6.) That the Gospel is a Law, even that new Law, which they contend for; containing Precepts, and also Promises, and Threatenings, as the Sanction of those Precepts. And that it saith, *Do and live*, in some allayed and milder Sense than the first Covenant. (7.) That the Covenant of Grace is conditional, and that Justification and Salvation are to be sought in this way, *viz.* of our fulfilling the Conditions. (8.) They don't heartily relish the Terms [*Surety*] as spoken of Christ, and [*Imputation*] as spoken of his Righteousness, nor admit them in the full and proper Sense. They abase those Texts that speak of God's Righteousness, as meaning only Man's Righteousness of God's accepting and appointing. *For it seems Man's Righteousness must stand, whatever becomes of Christ's.* (9.) They obscure and legalize the Doctrine of Faith and Works. Faith in Justification must be the same, as covenanting or consenting to have Christ as Lord and Saviour, or as Christianity it self: *Viz.* It is consider'd as a Duty perform'd by us, as a Condition of our Justification, and as a Principle and Root of all Obedience. *Again,* That Works are the express Condition of the Continuance of our Justification, having the same kind of Causality as Faith, tho' of somewhat less Efficacy. (10.) That *Paul* by Works, which he excludes from justifying, understands either Works of the Law of *Moses* as such, or Works of the Law of Innocency, *viz.* Perfect Works: But Gospel-Works must by no means be excluded; yet under their Gospel-Works, they include all the Duties of the Law, only they must be sure to be imperfect, else they will not justify; and so they surely are, and therefore can't justify. (11.) They speak

Speak of two Courts in which, or two Bars at which Men must be justify'd: The Bar of the Law, and the Bar of the Gospel: *Which will well nigh bring in the Popish double Justification.* (12.) That a Believer is not perfectly justify'd in this Life. A perfect and compleat Justification is not to be expected till the Day of Judgment.

*What shall we say? Must we be silent, and for Peace sake quietly give up the glorious Truths of the Gospel? Or if some thro' Cowardice, or Indifferency of Spirit, or Love of Ease, are willing so to do; shall not others be constrain'd by the Love of Christ to appear in his Cause? Shall we not warn honest, unwary Souls, that these are the Doctrines that are received and spread abroad by our young Generation, even of Dissenting Teachers? Or if they themselves, cunningly, and by Degrees, publish these to be their Sentiments; shall we not tell their Hearers, that there is latent Poison in them, which they discern not? And that a great Body of the Reformation has made themselves a \* Captain to return, if not to Egypt, yet so far that way as Mount Sinai, when we seem'd almost at the Borders of Canaan?*

*It is with great Reluctancy, as being unwilling to offend any Man, that I speak these things; and had not appear'd in this publick Way, had it not been to give, and to leave a Testimony to the Truth against growing Error. I know that many more able Pens have been engaged in this Controversy: But according to the Ability given me of Christ, I was willing to make this Effort, for the sake especially of that Part of the Country, where Providence has placed me; not so much with respect to what has been printed, but being chiefly moved by observing, That the Infection was very rise amongst Preachers. As to those whom I oppose, I could reason with them, I could beseech them, I could (so far as I know my own Heart) spend my*

---

\* Mr. Ric. Baxter.



## The Preface.

v

my self to the utmost, for their sakes, and the sake of Souls to whom they minister, if I might be (tho' most unworthy) at all instrumental to convince them of that which I take to be Error, and indeed another Gospel, and none of the Gospel of Christ in its Purity.

That there has been a nearer Approach to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome by those of the Protestant Profession in the Article of Justification, than what was admitted by the first Reformers from Popery, the Papists themselves are very apprehensive: As appears by a Book entituled, An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church. It is taken notice of, both in the Advertisement or Preface, p. 9, 10: and also in the Exposition it self, §. 6, and 7. upon the Articles of Justification, and Merit of good Works. Where he saith, Those who are never so little versed in the History of the pretended Reformation, are not ignorant how the first Authors proposed this Article [of Justification] to all the World, as the Principal of all the rest, and as the most essential Cause of their Separation. So that this is the most necessary to be well understood. And then after a cunning and plausible Account of the Doctrine of the Roman Church, as to these Articles, he adds: And indeed we must acknowledge, that the Learned of their Party do not contend so much of late about this Subject, as they did formerly. And there are but few who do not now confess, there ought not to have been a Breach upon this Point. But if this important Difficulty about Justification, upon which their first Authors laid all their strefs, be not look'd upon now as essential, by the wisest Persons among them, we leave them to think, what they ought to judge of their Separation, and what Hopes there would be of a Union, if they would but overcome their Prejudice, and quit the Spirit of Contention.

— Pudet

— Pudet hæc Opprobia nobis  
Et dici potuisse & non potuisse refelli.

*It will not be improper here (for opening Peoples Eyes and shewing them whether we are going) to insert a Passage of Mr. Baxter's, written by himself in the latter part of his Time, as I find it in his Life, published by Mr. Sylvester: It is as follows. My Censures of the Papists do much differ from what they were at first: I then thought that their Errors in the Doctrines of Faith were their most dangerous Mistakes, as in the Points of Merit, Justification by Works, Assurance of Salvation, the Nature of Faith, &c. But now I am assur'd that their Misexpressions, and misunderstanding us, with our Mistakings of them, and inconvenient expressing our own Opinions, have made the Difference in these Points to appear much greater than they are; and that in some of them it is next to none at all. But the great and irreconcilable Differences lye in their Church-Tyranny and Usurpations, and in their great Corruptions and Abasement of God's Worship, together with their befriending of Ignorance and Vice, Part 1. p. 131.*

*The same Author in his Aphorisms (Thes. 51. p. 130.) hath a Saying that I can't forbear taking a little notice of here. — It will be (saith he) a senseless shift, in such an Accusation, to shew Christ's legal Righteousness, instead of our own Evangelical Righteousness; to tell Satan, that Christ hath fulfilled the Law for us, when he is accusing us of not fulfilling the Gospel; silly Women are made believe by Antinomian Teachers, that this is a solid way of comforting: But Satan is a better Logician than to take quid pro quo, and to be baffled by such Arguing. Answ. The best is, That these Accusations are supposed to be false, and as to every Believer are so; that there would*

## The Preface.

vii

would need no Justification in this Matter, unless there were some Devil to bring in a false Charge. But notwithstanding Mr. Baxter's Triumph over his Antinomian Teachers; this one thing believed, that Christ is my Righteousness, and hath fulfill'd the Law, and satisfy'd the Justice of God for me, will bear out, and bear up the Soul against all Charges of Conscience, of Earth and Hell. And if it is not a solid way of comforting, I say that Satan is a more subtil Tempter, than to pursue this Point; but would let such Souls alone in their false Comfort. But forasmuch as he pursues it, it is because he would not let the Soul rest here, in so sure and safe a Rock. For so sure and impregnable is this strong Hold and blessed Fort, that all the fiery Darts of the Devil cannot demolish it. He that can by Faith tell Satan, that Christ has fulfill'd the Law, feels in himself that he is a Believer, and what Charge can then be against him? That Christ has dy'd, is an Answer to all Charges, Rom. 8. 33, 34. For how can he be an Unbeliever that builds his Soul upon this, and fetches his Comfort therefrom? Away, Satan! with thy Sophistry. Here's then the Object of Faith, without going to his Faith first, and then to Christ the Object. The silly Woman, whom Mr. Baxter despis'd, may take in more of this blessed Gospel, and the Comfort of it, than (perhaps) he was able to do. Luther was exercis'd with as great Temptations (it may be) as any Man, train'd up in that School, and had learn'd by Experience what was the right way of comforting tempted Souls. \* He, speaking of the Righteousness of Faith, saith thus, Whoso doth not understand or apprehend this Righteousness in Afflictions and Terrors of Conscience, must needs be overthrown. For there is no Comfort of Conscience so firm and so sure as this Passive Righteousness.

a

---

\* Argument to the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Engl. Translat.

ousness. *And a little after,* Wherefore the afflicted and troubled Conscience has no Remedy against Desperation and eternal Death, unless it take hold of the Forgiveness of Sins by Grace, freely offer'd in Christ Jesus: that is, the passive Righteousness of Faith, which if it can apprehend then it may be at quiet, and boldly say, I seek not this active or working Righteousness, altho' I know that I ought to have it. — Briefly, I rest only upon that Righteousness, which is the Righteousness of Christ and of the Holy Ghost. *And* — Where Christ is truly seen indeed, there must needs be full and perfect Joy in the Lord, with Peace of Conscience, which most certainly thus thinketh; Altho' I am a Sinner by the Law, and under its Condemnation, yet I despair not, yet I die not, because Christ liveth, who is both my Righteousness and my everlasting Life. *Elsewhere, viz. on Gal. 1. 11, 12.* I know (*said he*) in what Hours of Darkness I sometimes wrestle. I know how often I suddenly lose the Beams of the Gospel and Grace. — We have good Experience of this Matter, &c. But when in the very Conflict, we should use the Gospel, which is the Word of Grace, Consolation and Life, there doth the Law, the Word of Wrath and Death prevent the Gospel. *Luther's Heart was full of this Matter. And true spiritual Experience leads to this, however carnal Reason, Conscience or Satan may play the Sophister. What room is here for another Law, another Charge, another Righteousness, another way of Comfort? This Doctrine was the Foundation that the Reformed Churches were laid upon, in Opposition to the Popish Way of Works; but now it is only a way to comfort silly Women. For Satan will not take Quid for Quo, nor suffer some Men to rest, till he drive them from this Foundation; not because 'tis an unsafe, but because 'tis a safe one. Sure I am, there is abundance of Sweetness, Light and Comfort to doubting*  
and



and afflicted Consciences, in that honest plain Book of Luther on the Galatians : And it is no Soul-deceiving way, but the very Comfort of the Gospel, which is there propos'd, as that which was with Life, Warmth and Vigour upon his own Soul. But it is come to pass which he foretold, that after his Time this Doctrine of Justification would be almost extinguished in the Church.

That Men naturally are prone to rest in their own Righteousness, and that to bring them off this, to a single Dependance on that of Jesus Christ, is a great part of the Work of the Holy Ghost in Conversion, is confirm'd in the Experience of the Saints ; and therein also the Doctrine contain'd in this Book. This is a Matter of very great Consideration with me, and I regard not those, who, being unacquainted with the Work of God themselves, do make all such things the Object of their Ridicule. Take therefore two or three Testimonials herennto.

The first is of a private Christian, viz. Thomas Mowley, Apothecary, who dy'd 1669. His \* Experiences were left written with his own Hand. Having related many of God's Dealings with him in Conversions, &c. — When I was reading (saith he) in Mr. Shepard's Sincere Convert and Sound Believer, concerning the Soul's resting in Duties, and how hard a thing it is to forsake all its own Goodness, and wholly to throw it self upon a naked Christ — I was much troubled, and my Thoughts were much perplexed. At that Time also the Lord was pleas'd to let me see my own Nakedness so much, (and that which I took to be a Covering to it, made it seem to be much more naked than I could have imagin'd it to be) that then I thought the more I pray'd, the more I sinned ; and the more I confess'd, and repented, and bewail'd my own wretched Heart, the more

a 2

I had

---

\* Published at the End of his Funeral-Sermon, Entituled, Death unsung. By Mr. James Janeway. An. 1672. See p. 108.

## The Preface.

I had Cause to do so still, especially in the Time of Duty. And now I look'd upon my self in a most sad and destitute Condition, when I saw my own Goodness departing from me, which I Idoliz'd as the Rock of my Salvation, and such a numberless Number of Sins come afresh into my Mind. — And then I did see the want of Christ more than ever, not only to cover my Sins, but my Righteousness too. O then I did desire to say from my Heart, none but Christ, none but Christ, yea, Ten thousand Worlds for Christ; and with *Luther*, that if I were able to keep the whole Moral Law, I would not trust to this for Justification. And now I do find it a more hard thing by far to get out of my self, and from trusting in Duties, and wholly by Faith to rely upon Christ's Merits, than ever I found it to leave Sin. I found I was passive all along, and was not able to move a Step further than the Lord upheld and led me. *And a little after, p. 112.* In short, altho' I had been sick of Sin, yet never before then of Self-Righteousness; now seeing my self sick as much of the one, as of the other, I hop'd Christ would be my Physician, and that in him my Help should soon be found.

*Another, a part of whose Experience I shall mention, was a worthy Minister of the Gospel, viz. \* Mr. Owen Stockton, who has thus wrote:*

*March 26. 1654.* I find that tho' in my Judgment and Profession I acknowledge Christ to be my Righteousness and Peace, yet upon Examination I observe that my Heart hath done quite another thing, and that secretly I have gone about to establish my own Righteousness, and have deriv'd my Comfort and Peace from my own Actings. For when I have been disquieted by the Actings of my Sins, that which has

---

\* Whose Name is still fresh in the Memory of many in and about *Ipswich*, whose Souls were refreshed by his Ministry. His Life was published by *Mr. John Fairfax*, An. 1681.

has recover'd me to my former Peace hath not been, that I could find, God's speaking Peace thro' the Blood of Christ; but rather from the Intermision of Temptation, and the Cessation of those Sins. When I have been troubled at an evil Frame of Heart, I do not find, that the Righteousness of Christ hath been my Consolation; but that which has reliev'd me, as far as I can find, was, that afterwards I have found my self in a better Temper. Having been in Trouble and Perplexity, I have read the Scripture, gone to Prayer, and in doing these, I have been reliev'd: yet I do not find, that at such Times, I had real, true, living Communion with God, in such Duties; or that the Spirit of God did in those Duties reveal to me my Interest in Christ, and so quiet my Conscience. Hence I come to see, what great need I have, and that it is of singular Use, to watch over my Soul in all its Ways, both in reference to Sin, that I fall not into it; and when fallen, what the Carriage and Actings of my Soul are at such a Time; whether I flee for Relief to God in Christ, or to my own Works. — For as Satan keeps some alienated from God, by the gross Pollutions of the World; so others from Christ, by their establishing a Righteousness of their own. O Lord! break thou this Snare for me.

*These perhaps were Enthusiasts (with some Men) of I know not what. The last therefore I shall mention is Mr. Jenks, a Minister of the Church of England. The Title of whose Book, is, Submission to the Righteousness of God: Or, The Necessity of trusting to a better Righteousness than our own. In his Preface, p. 7, he tells us, He believed, and therefore hath he spoken the very Sense of his Soul. And having acquainted the World, p. 8, That when he first set out for a Preacher, he did appear, after the then Mode of a prevailing Party, a Stickler for Pelagius; and tho' he saw*  
*Scripture*

*Scripture, Articles, and Homilies, all standing in his way, — Yet, (saith he) thus I drove on for a while, in my new Province, till it pleas'd the gracious God, who knew what need I had to be humbled, in the midst of perfect Health, and all the Favour of Men, and Prosperity of the World, to throw me down under great and sore Troubles of Mind, and doubtings of my State, and dread of his Wrath, where for a long while I lay refusing to be comforted; — and in that School of sharp Discipline did I learn of my Heavenly Teacher, the \* Doctrine of Faith, which ever since I have made Conscience to maintain, with all my strength. And as I dare not upon any Temptation whatsoever, offer to oppose it my self, so it touches me in the most sensible part, to hear any Contempt signify'd against it by others, &c. And elsewhere, p. 13. Now I bless God for the Scriptures, and particularly St. Paul's Epistles, from which I can easily gather up a satisfying Notion of justifying Faith, when these Men, methinks, lead us into a Wood, as if they had a Mind only to darken a plain Matter, and amuse and lose the Reader; and while they confound Faith with Works, and make no difference between believing and obeying, what do they but take away all distinction between the Cause and the Effect? Thus he.*

*Surely Faith and Works are as much confounded as may be, where Faith is consider'd as a Work, not as an Act of Recumbency or Reliance on Christ, but of Consent to take him as a Lord; and more generally taken, as comprehending Love and all Works of the Gospel, as some way referable thereto. Is this Doctrine to be indur'd by them that love the Lord Jesus Christ? For my part, I think they speak without Book; having never under-*

---

\* What that Doctrine is, the whole Book declares, as directly opposite to *Nestorianism*.



derstood the Covenant of Works aright, neither the Covenant of Grace, nor seen the desperate Wickedness of their own Hearts, in trusting to their Duties, nor are brought wholly off from the Idol, Self, to trust in Christ alone; who set up this new Law, for Gospel: Or else the secret Transactions between God and their own Souls, are otherwise than their professed Opinions. For, under the specious Name of sincere Obedience, they bring in the whole Law, and all the Works of it, and give them a new Name, viz. Gospel-Works, and then all is well. But if the Ten Commandments are not included in their new Law, let them deny it; and if they cannot, let them who are spiritual judge, whether these are not the Works that Paul doth, and all that he could, exclude, from any part in justifying a Sinner? Look to it then, for as many as are of the Works of the Law (tho' you may call them Gospel) are under the Curse.

The Question is not, what Faith may include as a Principle of Sanctification, or what it leads unto? But how it is to be consider'd in our Justification? I care not to interpose in the Contention, whether Faith is an Instrument, Condition, or Causa sine quâ non, in Justification. I see there is no end of those Contentions. Those who call it a Condition, do suspend the Application of Christ's Righteousness upon our believing; whereas the Application thereof in the Hand of the Spirit is the Cause, and believing the Effect. Besides, most of them join other Conditions therewith. Those, who call it an Instrument, consider that it is Another's Righteousness, whereby we are justify'd. Therefore, because Faith is a Means of receiving Christ, and his Righteousness, and to express the meaning (as they thought) of the Preposition [by] when it is said, We are justify'd [by] Faith, they call'd it an Instrument; which to be sure it cannot be, if it self, or any thing in us, be our justifying Righteousness. For my part, I do not greatly delight in any of these Terms. But that Word

[In-

[Instrument] taken in Simplicity, and with some *La-  
wands*, I like best: For it will be hard to defend it in a  
strict Sense, as answering the Definition and Office of an  
Instrument according to the Logical Notion of it. If it  
be spoken of God, as it is, Rom. 3. 30. that he justifi-  
es the Circumcision by Faith, it is by giving Faith.  
And on our part, Faith is (as it were) an Instrument of  
receiving Christ; and his Righteousness; which Use  
is frequently ascribed thereunto. This is it which is  
intended thereby; and not, that we justify our selves  
by Faith. Howbeit, so far as Faith is, or is own'd to  
be an Instrument, (*To Credere*.) It is by Faith it self  
that we are justify'd; not as our justifying Righteous-  
ness, but as the Means of receiving Christ's Righteous-  
ness, which is \* that which justifies. For it is certain,  
it must be Faith it self, either in the Habit or in the  
Act, that is the Instrument; the Object cannot be so.  
Thus far Faith it self may be own'd, only allowing that  
the Spirit's Application is before our Reception in Order  
of Nature; for we receive what is given; and in the  
Virtue of Christ's Righteousness we believe, and recipro-  
cally, apprehend Him, who has apprehended us. This  
shuts it out from being a Condition of our having Be-  
nefit by Christ's Righteousness. Again, [by Faith] is  
taken Metonymically, for Christ the Object: Yet it  
connotes believing, and so it signifies by Christ believed  
on. So, that it is equally to his Honour, as if it had  
been said simply, we are justify'd by Christ. Mr. Bax-  
ter, in his Aphor. Theol. 76. p. 198. saith that Paul  
doth by the Word, Faith, especially direct your  
Thoughts to, Christ believed in; for to be justify'd  
by Christ, and to be justify'd by receiving Christ, is  
with him all one. I am therefore not solicitous what  
Logical Term to use in this Matter, tho' I do approve  
and have used that of [Instrument] in the Sense ex-  
plain'd.

## The Preface.

xv

plain'd. It is sufficient that we are justify'd by Christ, even by him alone, in the way of Believing, Acts 13. 39. as to Personal Justification; or that his Righteousness is unto all, and upon all that Believe. Rom. 3. 22.

Further, That by the Works of the Law, the Apostle Paul doth not mean the Law of Moses, as such, is clear from hence, That the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians were written to Gentile Churches, who were nothing concern'd with the Sinai Law as such. Now tho' that Sinai Covenant was only made with the Children of Israel, yet all the World were under the same Law for Substance, and those who are Redeemed from among the Gentiles, are said to be Redeemed from the Curse of the Law, Gal. 3. 13. c. 4, 5. And in the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle proved the Gentiles to be under Sin, by innumerable Instances of Transgression of the Law. For that Law that was not externally proposed, was written in their Hearts, Rom. 2. 14, 15. compare c. 3. 19. The whole World therefore were, and are under the Law. So that the Law is here consider'd not as Moses's Dispensation, in which Sense it was restrained to the Jews, but as of Universal Extent and Obligation. Paul's Design was to exclude all those Works and Deeds of our own performing, which Men seek to be justify'd by, and surely that is by the Moral Law. A Law that the Gentiles were concern'd in, by Transgression whereof they were Sinners, and under the Curse whereof they must perish, unless Redeemed from it.

Those then that would evidence themselves to be the Children of Promise, must look upon the Covenant of Grace as a free Promise, and the free Promise as that alone which can help them, Heb. 8. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. What can a Law of Commandments do,

b

where

where there is no Strength to perform? Happy are the Souls who are acquainted with the Covenants of Promise, Eph. 2. 12. Such was the Covenant of Noah, and the Covenant of Grace (whereof that was Typical) in the many Editions of it, Gen. 9 9—17. Isa. 54 9, 10. The Law was added because of Transgressions, and is useful to convince thereof; but it is the Gospel that holds forth a Saviour. The Distinction of a Gospel-Law and Gospel-Works is too slender to bear out a Man on a Death-Bed, and at the Day of Judgment, however some may now trifle with it.

Many think, and will often say, That Sinners are willing to have Christ as a Saviour, but not as a King and Law-giver. To speak freely, I verily think, as to great Numbers in the Professing World, the contrary is rather true. They would have Christ as a Law-giver, and are not willing to have him as a Saviour. The Papists contend, that Christ is a Law-giver, and you must be saved by keeping his Law. The Socinians and Arminians are all of them also agreed in this. But (sure I am not mistaken?) they are Enemies to all that Free-Grace whereby he saves Sinners: And so is every Man by Nature. True indeed, they would be saved; but they would not have Christ to be their Saviour. They would be saved by a Law, and so by Obedience of their own Performing. And whatever Man he is, of whatsoever Profession, that setteth up his own Righteousness, and puts any Trust therein, (and doubtless such there are, yea, the most of those who miscarry under a Profession, are such.) He, I say, would have Christ to be a Law-giver, (if it may be said he would have Christ at all :) But Christ, as a Saviour by his Righteousness, he would not, he will not have, John 5. 40. Mr. Mowley's Experience is a Confirmation of



of this, p. 100, 101, 102, 103. He thought verily he desired the Destruction of Sin, and loved to bear of a holy Life mightily, but the Doctrine of Denying Self-Righteousness was a hard Saying, and he could not, a great while, tell how to suppose one should be justify'd by Another's Righteousness. It is at least as great a Point, and as difficult, to submit to Christ's Righteousness, as to submit to his Government, Rom. 10. 3. 'Till the former be done, Men are but \* holy Hypocrites under all their Attainments. How often do we hear Signs and Marks laid down that make no Discovery of this.

The way of receiving Christ in Truth, as a Saviour, is for a Sinner, who has neither Righteousness nor Strength, nor any thing that's good, who sees all is lost, that there can be no repairing of Ruin'd Nature, to seek his whole Salvation from the Lord Jesus Christ, by Believing: Not only to seek Sanctification, as a legal Professor may think he doth; but to seek it from Christ, as the alone Author and Fountain of it, in a way of Believing. This is the Soul that desires to have Christ in his Kingly Office. Again, not only to follow after a justifying Righteousness; but to receive Christ for Righteousness, as the Matter of his Justification, Rom. 9. 30, 31, 32, 33. Otherwise, seeking Righteousness by the Works of the Law, they stumble at that Stumbling Stone, where so many Professors have stumbled, Men that seemed not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, and yet so far as never to obtain it.

What then? Is not Christ a Law-giver? See Luther speak, on Gal. 1. 16. 'The Gospel is such a Doctrine as admitteih no Law: Yea, it must be separated as far from the Law as there is Di-

stance between Heaven and Earth. This is easy to say, but hard to practice in the Agony and Conflict of Conscience. Again, on Ch. 2. 4, 5. No Law, let it be never so holy, ought to teach me that I am justified and shall live thro' it. The Gospel teacheth me not what I ought to do, but what Jesus Christ the Son of God has done for me. Again, on Ch. 2. 16. Christ, according to his true Definition, is no Law-giver, but a Forgiver of Sins and a Saviour. One would doubt whether Mr. Baxter had wrote against Luther, or Luther against him, but that we know who lived first. These things are spoken by Luther in the Article of Justification. Christ gives no Law to justify us by our own Obedience, neither in whole, nor in part. This is not the End of his coming, to be a Law-giver, but a Saviour, John 1. 17. Luke 19. 10. This is his main Work as Mediator, even to fulfil the Law, redeem from it, save us from its Curse, and dispose us under Grace, Rom. 6. 14.

Yet a Law-giver Christ is; Isa. 33. 22. (1.) As to the Worship and Discipline of his House; and therein to visible Saints, to justified and saved ones. In this Respect, let him be, O Believer, thy only Law-giver, and follow not the Dictates of Men, nor the Complying Humour of this Age, wherein Occasional Conformity is the grand Controversy of the Day. Maintain a Catholick Love, but avoid a Catholick Compliance: And then never fear the Brand of being a Bigot to a Party, for being faithful to Christ and thy own Soul. (2.) In that He teaches the Law as a Rule of Conversation to Believers. Thus, He is not first a Law-giver, and then a Justifier; but first a Justifier, then a Law-giver. That is, He teaches how his Justified Ones are to walk before God, and they are to seek the Law at his Mouth,

Mal.

*Mal. 2. 7.* I think also that Unregenerate Men should do all the good they are capable of, and wait upon God in a way of Duty, it may be a lessening of Condemnation. But let them take heed how they oppose the Gospel, for this is to sin with a high Hand.

It will be said, it may be, that I have not taken a sufficient Notice of that Concession of the new Methodists, That Christ is our legal Righteousness; that all the Righteousness which satisfies the Law, we must look for in Christ, and not in our selves.

Ans. It is not worth the Notice; because \* what they give with one Hand they take away with the other. They own Christ's Righteousness only as a Satisfaction for the Breach of the Law, and that therefore his Active Righteousness is not imputed, and so destroy the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us, in the true and proper Notion of Imputation. How is Christ our Righteousness then, especially when there is another Law to be fulfill'd by us for Righteousness?

Again, it may be said, They make Faith but the Condition of our Partaking of Christ's Righteousness, and thus they take to be less than an Instrument.

Ans. When we (according to them) are under a New Law, requiring Faith and Obedience, as a Rule of Righteousness, and which must be fulfilled by Personal Performances, then Faith, with the Works that attend it, is our true Justifying Righteousness. Whatever it is as to Christ's Satisfaction of the Old Law, (there perhaps it is only a Condition, and too much by that) yet as to the New Law, which with them is the Rule of our Justification, here it must be a Justifying Righteousness.

I wish from my Heart there were no Occasion for such Debates as these. And why may we not in all

---

As Dr. Tully observes, *Paul. Justific. c. 11. p. 117.*

Love

## The Preface.

Love and Friendship endeavour to shew one another our Mistakes? O that all of Self might vail to Christ, and his Glory might be sought alone!

I had no Thoughts, in the Beginning of this Work, to meddle with any Man, any further than his Doctrine might incidently be concern'd. But I found my self under a Necessity to answer Objections rais'd against the Doctrine here maintain'd; and finding many of them gather'd to my Hand in Mr. Clark's Book of Justification, and being very sorry to find so noted, and indeed judicious, an Expositor, so far deviating from the Truth, I could not choose but speak somewhat largely to many Points in that Book. The rest (I think) fall of themselves. I aimed not at a formal Answer to the whole.

I have endeavour'd to use all the Plainness which the Subject treated of did admit. The Judicious Reader will observe the Chain and Connexion of the several Parts which runs thro' the whole, by comparing the Contents of the several Chapters. But it is more than Time to dismiss the Reader hence to the Body of the Work. Judge for your selves in the matter of your own Salvation. And the Blessing of the Spirit accompany these Labours to the Hearts of the Readers. Amen and Amen.





# CONTENTS

## OF THE

### CHAPTERS.

**C**Hap. I. *Shews, That the Law is a Rule of Duty and Obedience; That as such it is most perfect and unchangeable in every State of Man, whether sinless, fallen, or recover'd by Grace.* p. 1.

Chap. II. *That the Rule of Obedience for Duty, and the Rule of Righteousness for Justification, are the same.* p. 25.

Chap. III. *That fallen Man, both as in the Fall, and when recover'd, is utterly unable to answer the Demands of the Law, or fulfil such a Righteousness as it requires unto Justification.* p. 35

Chap. IV. *That Jesus Christ, as Surety for the Elect, hath in their stead fulfilled the Law as a Rule of Righteousness for Justification, and born the Penalty or Curse due for the Transgression of it.* p. 41

Chap. V. *That the Righteousness fulfilled by Jesus Christ, in his own Person, in Obedience and Suffering, is that Justifying Righteousness which is equally imputed to all Believers.* p. 68

Chap. VI. *That Faith is not the Matter of our Justification, nor meritorious Cause of it; but is used therein only as an Instrument, not as a Work.* p. 85

THE CONCLUSION.

p. 100

# CONTENTS

OF THE

## CHAPTERS

Chapter I. The Nature and Extent of the Right of Property in Land. p. 1.

Chapter II. The Nature and Extent of the Right of Property in Personal Estate. p. 27.

Chapter III. The Nature and Extent of the Right of Property in Real Estate. p. 37.

Chapter IV. The Nature and Extent of the Right of Property in Personal Estate. p. 41.

Chapter V. The Nature and Extent of the Right of Property in Real Estate. p. 68.

Chapter VI. The Nature and Extent of the Right of Property in Personal Estate. p. 83.

THE CONCLUSION

L. 100



A

# VINDICATION

## OF THE

# Eternal Law.

AND

## Everlasting GOSPEL, &c.

### C H A P. I.

*Shewing, That the Law is a Rule of Duty and Obedience; that as such it is most Perfect and Unchangeable in every State of Man, whether Sinless, Faln, or Recover'd by Grace.*

**T**HE Honour of the Royal Law, which is a very considerable Part of the Word of God, is not only asserted and declared therein; As, that it is *Pure, Perfect, exceeding Broad, Precious, Everlasting, Holy, Just and Good*, Prov. 30. 3. Psal. 19. 7. and 119. 96, 127, 160. Rom. 7. 12. But also is kept up and magnify'd by the Gospel of the Grace of God. Isa. 42. 21. Rom. 3. 31. Wherefore it becomes the *Ministers of the Word*, to make this a considerable Part of their Work. This is

very much the Aim of this Treatise: Wherein (depending on Divine Assistance) I begin with the *first* Revelation which God made of Himself, and of his Will to Man, in the Beginning of Time; and from thence I would descend to *Later* Revelations, both *before*, and *in* Gospel-Times.

The Holy, All-wise God having created reasonable Creatures, gave to them a *Law*, the Rule of that Obedience and Duty which is the Natural Result of the Relation between God the Creator, and such Creatures. This Law required perfect sinless Obedience: No less could God call for, no less was suited to the State of Innocency and Perfection, wherein Man was created (for of Man we speak, and not of Angels.) This Law given at first was written on the Heart, and needed not to be externally proposed. That positive Prohibition, *Not to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil*, was but for the Trial of Obedience; and the Tree it self, a Sacrament or Symbol of *Death* in Case of Disobedience; as the Tree of *Life* was a Symbol or Sacrament of Life in Case of Obedience. These Symbols clearly shew, that the *Law* was established into a *Covenant*. And a *Covenant* it was truly and properly: For *Adam* had no *Right* to deny his Consent to the Terms which God proposed; and being yet Sinless and Holy, he had no *Will* thereto; but agreed both to the *Preceptive Part*, and to the *Sanction*, as Holy, Just, and Good.

This Law and Covenant our first Parents transgressed. Whereupon the *Promissory Part* thereof entirely ceased; but the *Threatning* took Place, and came in Force by that Transgression: The *Commanding Part* thereof still continued, the Duties therein required being founded in the necessary Relation between God and reasonable Creatures; and what was Duty *before* the Fall, remained still Duty *after* the Fall, tho' Man had no Power left of Obeying.

Grace



Grace now interpos'd; *viz.* by visible Dispensation: And now was the Time to prevent poor Man from Despair and Destruction. A new Covenant, even a Covenant of *Grace* was promulgated, *Gen. 3. 15.* wherein God took Care to secure the Honour of his *Law*, and *his own* Glory in that former Covenant. This I shall not now speak unto; but hereon there was again *Commerce* and *Communion* settled between *God* and *Men*; and positive Institutions, as *Sacrifices* (Chap. 4. 4.) were enjoyn'd by God, as *Means* of that Communion, as *Types* of the promised Saviour, and *Signs* or *Seals* of the Covenant of *Grace*, held forth in the first *Promise*.

This Promise it pleased God to renew unto *Abraham*, with Enlargements, and further Explication, letting him know that of *his* Seed the Promised Saviour should come, and ratifying the same by an *Everlasting Covenant* established with him: So that now the *Promise* did more *expresly* and *explicitly* put on the Nature of a *Covenant*.

Afterwards God made a Covenant with the *Israelites* the Seed of *Jacob*, upon Mount *Sinai*. The Nature whereof as a *Covenant* with that People, I shall not speak so much unto; but as a *Law* eternally and universally Obliging: For *the Law* was given by *Moses*. Nor do the Laws that concerned the *Polity* and *Government* of that People as a Common-wealth, called the *Judicial Law*, come under present Consideration; neither the *Positive Institutions*, *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of Worship, called the *Ceremonial Law*; All which were comprehended under the General Name of the *Law* given at *Sinai*: But I intend the *Ten Words*, or *Ten Commandments*, which God himself pronounced and uttered with an Audible Voice, in the Hearing of the People, *Exod. 20.* which are called the *Moral Law*. In the Matter of these *Ten Words*, there was a *Repetition* or *Rehearsal* of the *Law* of Works made with

*Adam*, in all its Demands of Duty: In the *Manner* of their being utter'd and given, there was a *Representation* of the Terrour of that first Covenant to Fall Man: And all this for Gospel Ends. In these is contained the Sum of all that Duty and Obedience which God requirve of his Creature, Man. And again, these *Ten* are comprehended in *Two Words*, *Love to God* and *Love to our Neighbour*; Mat. 22. 37, —40. The *Moral Law* therefore given by *Moses*, was, and is a *Transcript* of the *Law of Innocency* made with *Adam*, requiring perfect sinless Obedience. This I would a little confirm; becaule to me, some Men's Talking, that God never dealt with Man since the Fall upon those Terms, *Be innocent, and be happy*, seem to have no favourable Aspect upon this Truth.

Take therefore which Commandment you please; and the same was a Law to our first Parents, and before the Fall written in their Hearts. Doth the the Law of the Ten Commandments require us to know and acknowledge God to be the only true God, and our God, and so to worship and serve him? This was also a Law to *Adam*, and is so to the Angels in Heaven. Did the Law of *Moses* require the Worshipping of God, only in his own Ways, according to his own Appointment? So did the Law of Creation. Briefly, the Law written in *Adam's Heart*, was a perfect Law of Love to God, and Love to his Neighbour: Under which Two Heads, Christ sums up the Moral Law or Ten Commandments. Hence it follows, that the one of these Laws is the *Transcript* of the other, and the Requirements the same. This was the undoubted Meaning of the Assembly in their shorter Catechism; Qu. 40, 41. *The Rule* (say they) *which God AT FIRST revealed to Man for his Obedience was the Moral Law*. And then they add, in Answer to the next Question, *The Moral Law is summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments* So that

that the Ten Commandments are for Substance the same with that Law *at first* revealed to Man, that is, written in the Heart of *Adam*. And this farther appears from hence, that there was an *Antecedent* Obligation upon the People of *Israel* to keep this Law of the Ten Commandments, before its Promulgation on Mount *Sinai*; and also, that there is so upon us *Gentiles* under the Gospel: Which must needs be, because it is a Draught or Copy of the very Law of Creation. Tho' there was a particular Obligation upon the People of *Israel* to the Observation of it, arising from the Manner of its Promulgation to *them*, which *We* are not concern'd with. And it was the Rule of the Covenant between God and them, God proposing it to them for their Acceptance, and they taking it upon them to keep, *Exod.* 24. 3. *Dent.* 5. 27. whence it became in some Sense a formal explicit Covenant between God and them; this we are no Way concern'd in. And lastly, Christ in Fulfilling the Law of *Moses*, which he was under as an *Israelite*, fulfilled the very Law of Creation. It remains therefore that *that* Law given by *Moses*, called the *Moral Law*, because it is perpetually binding to all Men, was no *Remedial Law*, nor Law of lower Terms, but did require *Perfect, Sinless Obedience*. And if that Law were not, then there never was *any* such Remedial Law; because then Men were fallen, and the Way of Salvation was always the same.

Howbeit, I willingly grant, There are some real *Disagreements* between the Law of Innocency given to *Adam*, and that given by *Moses*, altho' *materially* they agree, as has been shewn, unless any Thing in the Fourth Commandment, relating to the Sabbath may be an Exception, about which I dispute not. They differ'd then,

I. *In the Intention of the Law-giver, and his End in giving them.* For that Law given to *Adam* was intended by God as a formal *Covenant of Works* with him and his Posterity. That given to the People of *Israel* was not so intended, made or constituted by God; for then it had been contrary to the Promise and Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, (*Gal. 3. 17, 21.*) and they could have had no Salvation under it. And whereas I have already asserted that the Law at *Sinai* had the Nature of a Covenant between God and that People; we must know, (1.) That it had so as to *Temporal* good Things in the Land of *Canaan*. (2.) That it had an Eye to *Jesus Christ*, and his Coming under the Law, and so was truly a Covenant of Works to *Him*. For tho' there was no such Thing expressed in the Covenant of Works, *Thou or thy Surety shall die*; yet this was the great Design of God in the *Sinai* Law, even *Christ's* Coming under the same, *Gal. 3. 19.* and therefore *Moses* was a Typical Mediatour in the giving thereof. (3.) That the *Levitical Ordinances* of Priests, Tabernacle, Altar, Sacrifices, &c. were an Essential Branch of this *Sinai* Covenant: And herein there was Relief for their Miscarriages and Sins. See *Heb. Chap. 8.* and 9. In the Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians* the Apostle hath a Respect to that Part of this Law or Covenant, wherein there was a Representation of the Covenant of Works: And in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* he treats of that Branch thereof which was a Representation (in Types) of the Covenant of Grace: And his Discourse in those Epistles is very different to him that hath an Ear to hear.

II. *In the Time and Manner of their being given.* (1.) As to Time. The Law was given to *Adam* in his very Creation: And so it was the first Dispensation where-



wherein God dealt with Man for Eternal Life: And thus the *Law* is more ancient than the *Gospel*, as to what was done in Time. The *Sinai Law* was given about Two Thousand Five Hundred Years after the Fall, and that upon a Supposal of Gospel Grace and Mercy fore-going: And thus the Gospel is more Ancient than any Law given to *Fallen Man*: Because it is not a Law of *Commandments*, but a free *Promise* that must help and relieve in a Faln State. Therefore God came forth towards Man when Faln, *Gen. 3. 15.* not in any Law, but by a *Promise*, as suitable to his present State. If God gives a Law (as he did the Ten Commandments) to Fallen Creatures, who have not Power to fulfill; it supposes that he has a Design of *Grace* and *Mercy* in Hand, or he would never thus treat with them: And therefore there is no Law *since their Fall*, given to the Faln Angels. If God call for Worship, it supposeth a Way wherein he is appeased, and can accept that Worship. If he call for any Sort of Obedience, it is the same. It doth not necessarily suppose *that* Law to be a *Remedial Law* (which perhaps has partly led to that Mistake) but it doth suppose a Remedy provided. \* If Faith and Repentance are commanded, that Command supposeth a Promise of the same *first* in Being, or else they would be in vain commanded. Faith and Repentance do first belong to the Gospel in the Nature of *Promises*, contained in the first Promise. Thus the Gospel is Oldest. (2.) As to the *Manner* of their being given. The Law of Innocency was an *Internal Law* written in the Heart; the Law of *Moses External*, given by the Voice of God, with Majesty and Terror, written in Tables of Stone, the Figures of the Hard Heart of Man,

B 4

wherein

\* *Evangelium docet, Lex obligat & jubet.* Maccovi j Distinc. Cap. 3.

wherein the Law is promised in the New Covenant to be written.

III. *In the different State of the Persons to whom they were given.* The Israelites were Sinners, as were all the World in that Day: But our first Parents were in a State of *Innocency*; and the Law which they were under, was nothing else than that Righteousness which was created together with them, excepting only that Positive Prohibition, *Gen. 2. 17.* The Giving of the Law on *Sinai* in an *External* Manner, did suppose Man a *Faln* Creature, a Sinner. The giving of the Law by *external* Commandments doth suppose so much. And Commandments in a *Negative* Form (as Dr. *Goodwin* observes) suppose the Nature of Man to run cross with the Law. Hence the Law as given to *Adam*, he being in a State of *Innocency*, required not Faith in Jesus Christ and his Righteousness, nor Repentance, as it is a godly Sorrow for Sin; But as it was given at *Sinai*, and has *Faln* Man for its Object, it certainly requires both; Jesus Christ having been before revealed in the *Promise*. Look but upon the different State of Man, either as *Upright*, or as *Faln*, and it is evident, that the very same Command; *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c.* as it respects *Upright Man*, requires no such Thing as Faith in the Mediator, in his Righteousness, nor Repentance from Dead Works; yet when it hath *Faln* Creatures for its Object, it doth require both: For a Sinner cannot love God, but thro' a Mediator: Nor can he, nor doth he Love him, unless he hate Sin, turn from it, and repent of it, after a Godly Sort. Hence the Commands of Faith in Christ, and of Repentance towards God, touched neither the first nor second *Adam*. And for Christ to fulfill the Law in a Way suited to a Sinless State was sufficient.

IV. The Law given to *Adam*, and that given by *Moses* differ in *Regard of a Mediator*. In *Adam's* Covenant there was no Mediator. And, alas! what are Creatures without one, when they have to do with the glorious God? In giving the Law at *Sinai*, *Moses* was a Mediator, as a Priest extraordinary; for Mediation belong'd to the Priesthood. Herein he was a Type of *Christ*, the Mediator of a better Testament. *Moses* stood between God and the People, received the Law from God's Hand, and gave it to *Israel*. Hereby they were instructed to receive the Law at *Christ's* Hand, only as a *Rule of Life* touching their own Obedience, and to look to *Christ*, the Mediator, for the perfect fulfilling of it as a *Covenant*. To his Satisfaction they were also directed by the Sacrifices ordain'd by God at *Sinai*. These things I have been the larger upon, because the right understanding of them is very useful in the Doctrine of Justification.

I proceed to shew, *That the Law in its highest Perfection is a Rule of Obedience unto fallen Man; that there is no Abrogation of it, nor Derogation from it; but as a Rule of Duty, it requires perfect and sinless Obedience.* For,

I. The Moral Law, in its highest Perfection, is suited to the unchangeable Nature and Will of God. He design'd it as a Representation of his \* glorious Holiness. Now this it cannot represent, if it require not Perfection, *Mat. 5. 48*. But when it requires perfect Holiness, it is a fit Expression of God's Holiness; and when it is invariable and immutable, it doth fitly represent to Men the Immutability of the Nature and Will of God, whose Law it is. It may not

---

\* Mr. Polhill calls it the Off-shining of God's Holiness.

not be imagin'd that he, *who is of one Mind*, should recede from, recall, disanul or dispense with his Law, to admit a less perfect. The Laws of the *Medes and Persians* were *unalterable*, because they were loth to own that *Imperfection* and want of Foresight, which all Men must acknowledge in themselves; well knowing that all Laws bear the Impress and Image of the Law-makers upon them. God's Law therefore must be perfect and invariable, seeing with him there is no Imperfection nor Variation, *Jam. 1. 17.*

II. *It is suited to our Relation unto God, and Dependance on him in every State.* It is a very righteous Law, suited to the Relation between God and us; a perfect Rule of that Obedience which we owe to God. Nothing less can be due to him than *perfect Love, perfect Obedience.* To suppose a Law given by him requiring or admitting imperfect Faith, Love and Obedience, is an unrighteous Imagination. And herein the Wisdom of God appears in giving a Law at first which needed no Alteration, whatever Condition Man might come into.

III. *Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, expounding the Moral Law or Ten Commandments, clearly sheweth that the Law requires nothing less than Perfection, and can admit of nothing short thereof.* Of this I must speak a little. Expounding the *Sixth Commandment*, *Mat. 5. 21—26*, he correcteth the false Opinions received from the corrupt Glosses of the Doctors of that Day, as Expositors agree. They thought if they took away the Life of no Man, that Commandment, [*Thou shalt not kill*] was kept. But (saith he, *v. 22.*) *I say unto you, that whosoever is angry, without a Cause, shall be in danger, &c.* Not that he gave a New Law, for that was not his Work, *Joh. 1. 17.* but expounded the *Old*, according to the true meaning thereof, in  
its



its Perfection and Spirituality. *If a Man be angry without a Cause*, without a just Cause, if it be not Sin that he is angry with ; if there be Malice, Revenge, yea, or rash Anger in his Heart, which are the first Motions towards Murder, *he shall be in Danger of the Judgment*, that is, of the righteous Judgment of God, in the Account of the Law. Now by Virtue of what Command is that ? Even of this, *Thou shalt not kill*. For it would be impious to imagine that the Law of Sinai did admit of Murder, yea, or Malice, or rash Anger, *in the Heart*.

Again, *Mat. 5. 27.* he expoundeth the *Seventh Commandment*. The Doctors and Teachers of that Day took hold of the Letter, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*, and interpreted it only of the outward Act. But Christ telleth us, an *Inclination* that way, a *Purpose* of sinning, yea, the lustful Thoughts and Desires of the *Heart*, or, a Glance of the *Eye*, are a Breach of the Law, even of this Law. This is the *Sincerity*, which the Law calls for, and nothing 'short thereof is so accounted thereby.

V. 33. He explains the *Third Commandment* ; concerning *the taking of the Name of God in vain*, or foolish and rash Swearing. He hath respect to *Lev. 19. 12.*, which they (it seems) interpreted of forswearing themselves. But (saith he) I say unto you, *Swear not at all*, that is, by Creatures, *neither by Heaven, nor by the Earth, &c.* that is a profaning God's Name, contrary to the Third Commandment : Nor by God himself, of *Choice* or *unnecessarily*. Swearing is *sinful*, whenever it is *unnecessary*, much more when it is *rash* and *vain*.

The following \* Verses to the end of this Chapter set before us these weighty Points, (1.) What Behaviour the Law requireth under *Sufferings* and *Injuries*,

v. 38—

---

\* V. 38 -- 48, I desire the Reader to consult the Verses quoted, as he goes along.

v. 38 ~~2~~ 41. (2.) What Carriage towards those that are in need of our Assistance and Charity, v. 42. (3.) What Frame of Spirit and Demeanour towards our Enemies, v. 43. All these things belong to the Second Table, and are to be referred to that Love we owe to our Neighbour.

1. How we are to behave our selves under Injuries. The 38, 39, and 40 v. forbid all Malice, and all revenging of a Man's self, the doing any thing in a way of Revenge, either privately, or publickly (as in Courts of Judicature) whatsoever a Man suffers, Rom. 12. 17. Here is also requir'd Patience and Meekness even to Perfection. Take Adam for Instance, such as he was before the Fall, in these Respects; take Christ for an Example, 1 Pet. 2. 21, 22, 23. Such we ought to be, such the Law requireth us to be. This is the short and (I think) clear meaning of these Verses, which do in part belong to the Ninth Commandment.

2. Verse 42. holdeth forth the Law of Kindness and Charity, as the foregoing did the Law of Meekness and Patience. And why is it laid down in such full and expressive Terms? To teach us, that whatsoever one that's perfect, full of Kindness, Love and good Works, even as Christ himself, would do, That the Law of God requires, and Christians ought to do, and nothing less. See Deut. 15. 7, 8, 9, 10.

3. The 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, Verses teach what Frame of Spirit and Behaviour the Law of God requires towards our Enemies. When the Law required Love to their Neighbour; they by Neighbour, understood, him that loved them, and wished them well; and so inferred,

---

\* Vid. Calvini Institut. l. 2. c. 8. §. 6, 7.

inferred, they might hate their Enemies. But Christ shews their Mistake, and tells them, *they must love their Enemies*. By what Law, I beseech you? Even by the Law of *Moses*, which they had corrupted. This Exhortation is enforced, (1.) From the Consideration of God's Bounty and Kindness, and that his Children ought to be like their Father, v. 45. (2.) From the Consideration of what *others do*, whom *they* ought to excel, v. 46, 47.

Briefly, the Sum of all is, *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect*, v. 48: These Words justify the Interpretation which I have given hitherto; viz. that the Law requires *Perfection* in every thing, in every Grace and Duty; Perfection of *Patience, Chastity, Reverence of God and his Name, Meekness, Charity, Love, &c.* For Christ is expounding the Law. Now the Law of God (saith he) requires Conformity to God: A likeness not of *Equality*, but that we bear his Image to the utmost which Creatures are capable of. Thus you see what the Law, even the Ten Commandments, which were given to *fallen Man*, and are *still of Force*, do require. Even *perfect, sinless Obedience*. You'll say, *who then can be saved?* I answer, *No Man*, by his own Performances: But Salvation is to be sought by *another's* Righteousness, even that of *Christ*, who has perfectly kept this Law for us; as shall (God willing) be afterwards shewn.

IV. *The Requirements of the Law are to be measured by Christ's Obedience.* Such as *He* was, such the Law requires *us* to be. But Jesus Christ was *perfect*. Look upon *him*, and you may see what God calls for, from poor Man. Christ was a *living Law*. The Holiness of the Law was *exemplify'd* in him. He was a perfect Pattern of that perfect Rule; but not more perfect than the Law requir'd.

V. Were the Law *abolished*, or were any Thing *abated* from it, and a *milder* Law admitted into its Place, *there would be no Sin in them who were under such a Law; or at least it would be difficult, and perhaps impossible to know what were Sin and what were not.* For Sin is a *Transgression of the Law.* The Law of Grace spoken of by some, requires not *Perfect*, but *sincere* Obedience. And wherever *that* is (whatever Imperfections there may be) there is a Fulfilling of that Law, or else there would be no Justification or Salvation by it. Can there be any Transgression here, when it is essential to this Law to admit of Imperfection and Sin, under the Notion of accepting Sincerity? If sincere Obedience in the lowest Degree of it, be not a Fulfilling of this Law, how is it then a *Remedial* Law? And if there be Degrees, it is no just Standard of Sin and Duty. It will be said, *Believers are Sinners in a strict Law Sense*, according to the Law of Creation. Yes verily, and Conscience will make every Man own (will he, nill he) *that* Law to be the Rule and Standard, whereby to judge of Sin and Righteousness. And if so, there can be no other, there is no Room left for a new Law. They cannot stand together. If there is a *New*, the *first* *waxes old*, and *vanishes away*, Heb. 8. 13. Thus the Assertors of a *New* Law effectually overthrow themselves, whilst they are forc'd to have Recourse to the *Old*, to judge of Sin and Righteousness.

VI. Consider we the Persons who are the Objects of the Law's Requirements, in their different States, *either as in the Fall, or as Recover'd.* And here I maintain,

1. *That the World by Nature are under the Law, and That those who Perish, do perish under the Law of Cre-*



*Creation*, that Law or Covenant at first made with *Adam*. This all Men by Nature are under, (1.) *As to Obedience*. They are held obliged to keep the whole Law, tho' they are not able so to do: The Law considering not what they are, but what they ought to have been, to wit, *perfect Creatures*, Rom. 2. 12, 14, 15. *As many as have sinned without Law*, without any external or visible Promulgation of the Law, which *Israel* had on *Sinai*, shall perish without Law. There must be some Law then which they are concern'd in, for *Sin* is not imputed when there is no Law, Rom. 5. 13. and so there were no Perishing. Clearly then it is the *Law of Creation*, the *Work whereof* is written in their *Hearts*, Ver. 15. tho' there had been no visible giving of it to them. (2.) *As to Punishment*. They are Obnoxious to *Death*, Rom. 5. 13, 14. *Sin* and *Death* were in the *World*, before *Moses* gave the Law. And that must be by Virtue of some Law: Of what Law? It could be no other than the *Law of Creation*. It was by the Breach thereof, that *Sin* and *Death* enter'd, Ver. 12. and that Men are obnoxious to the *Eternal Curse*, *As many as are of the Works of the Law*, Gal. 3. 10. There are some therefore who are so, even all who are not of *Faith*, and so blessed with faithful *Abraham*, Ver. 9. These the *Apostle* declares are under the *Curse*. Wherefore Men by Nature are under the Law, even as it is opposite to being under *Grace*. And under the *Curse of the Law* they perish, unless *Redeemed* from it, Gal. 3. 13. And as to God's Dealing with Men upon such Terms [*Be Innocent and be Happy*] since the Fall; it is sufficient that he dealt with them so in *Adam*, and that they have been once *Transgressors*, whereby all the *World* lies in a *Falln State*, and need not to be lost over again under another Law, or \* *Universal Covenant*

---

\* Vide *Robothami Disquisi. in Hypoth. Baxt. de Fædere Græ-*  
*tiz*, p. 19, 20. &c.

venant of Grace. And as to those who are *Saved*, God sent forth his Son to fulfil the *Law* for them, and to purchase *Faith*, whereby his Redemption might be received. This is not to save them by a *Law* but by *Grace*: For these two are the Opposite Parts and Members of a Distinction, *Rom.* 6. 14. *John* 1. 17. and do differ in their whole *Nature*, and not in *Degree* only: Else it might be read backwards, That *Grace* came by *Moses*, and a *Law* by Jesus Christ. Therefore these two ought not to be confounded by such an uncouth Expression; [*a Law of Grace*] where no Man knows certainly what is meant by either.

2. That Believers are under this perfect *Law* as a Rule of Life. That they are under the *Law* to Christ, the Apostle declares *1 Cor.* 9. 21: that they are under it as a Rule of Life and Conversation, is or ought to be agreed on all Hands. It is true they have this *Law* not only externally propos'd, but written in the Heart; whence they press towards the Perfection of it. The Love of Christ is the Motive to Obedience, and the *Law* it self is held forth to them, as a fulfill'd satisfied *Law*, in the Hand of Christ: So that tho' they fail in their Obedience, they cannot fall under its Condemnation, *Rom.* 8. 1. Because as a *Covenant* it is abolished, when it remains as a *Directory* of Obedience. And the Love to God and our Neighbour, which it requires as a Rule, is no less than *Perfect Love*, and so of every Duty. One Design of our Lord Jesus in *Mat.* 5. was to teach the Use of the *Law*, as a Rule for his Disciples to walk by; See *Ver.* 44, 45. And it is the Spirituality and Perfection of the *Law* that he teaches there; as has been shewn.

Were Human Testimonies wanting, I might bring in a Cloud of Witnesses, to confirm the Point I am

upon. Dr. Ames excellently teaches \* That the  
 ' Matter of Obedience is that very Thing which is  
 ' commanded of God, and so summarily is contain-  
 ' ed in the Ten Commandments; for otherwise the  
 ' Law of God should not be Perfect. The Law of  
 ' God therefore, altho' in respect of Believers it  
 ' be (as it were) abrogated, both as to the Force of  
 ' Justifying, which it had in the State of Integrity,  
 ' and as to the Force of Condemning, which it had in  
 ' the State of Sin; yet it is of full Force and Strength  
 ' as to the Matter of Direction, and also it retaineth  
 ' some Power of Condemning, because it reproves and  
 ' condemns Sin in Believers, altho' it cannot fully  
 ' condemn Believers themselves, who are not un-  
 ' der the Law, but under Grace.

Query. Why was such a Law requiring Perfect O-  
 bedience given, as at Mount Sinai when Man could not  
 keep it? I answer,

1. To set forth the Strictness and Terroure of the Cove-  
 nant of Works. That we might know what the Law  
 which we had violated, required; what were the  
 Terms and Conditions of Life and Happiness in that  
 Covenant; how terrible it is to Fain Sinners, that  
 we might look for the Fulfilment of it in Another.

2. To Discover Sin, Reprove thereof, and condemn for it.  
 Because the Knowledge of the Law, and the Sense of Sin  
 were so much worn out. Wherefore then serveth the Law,  
 Gal. 3. 19. if there was a Promise before, and Salvation  
 thereby? It was added, viz. to the Promise, because  
 of Transgression, to reprove thereof, and put a Check  
 thereon, Rom. 3. 19.

3. To awaken and stir up Men, to inquire after a  
 Saviour and Justifier, whilst the utter Impossibility  
 C of

\* *Amesij Medul.* l. 2. ch. 1. § 20, 21. *Materia Obedientiæ*  
 See also the Assemblies Catechism upon the Command

of obtaining Righteousness and Life by Works, is discover'd. The People of *Israel*, moved with the Terror of giving the Law, asked a *Mediator*, which we find was pleasing to God, *Deut. 5. 27, 28.* This Use the Spiritual Seed among them made of it: The Rest took it to be a Covenant of Works with themselves for Eternal Life, not understanding the meaning of God therein.

4. In the Wisdom of God, to make way for, and be a means of, *Christ's* being born or made under the Law, in order to his fulfilling of it for us. As Mr. *Petto* excellently sheweth, in his \* Book of the Covenant, p. 134. \* Nor do I see (saith he) how by any visible Dispensation, *Jesus Christ* could have been born actually under the Law, if this *Sinai* Covenant had not been made. For the Covenant of Works, being violated in the first *Adam*, was at an End as to the promising part of it, &c. This therefore undoubtedly was the Way and Means, whereby *Jesus Christ*, who was above the Law, was made under the Law for us, in a solemn and publick manner. For the People of *Israel* took it upon them, to do all the Words of this Law, *Exod. 24. 3, 7.* From whence, every one, who was born of that Race, was born under that Law, that *Sinai* Covenant, which was ratify'd by the sprinkling of Blood, v. 8. And unless they sought Relief in *Jesus Christ*, the promised Seed, it became a formal Covenant of Works to them. But *Christ* was mainly intended in it, to be the End thereof. It was added because of Transgressions, TILL THE SEED SHOULD COME, to make an end of Sin, and finish Transgression, *Gal. 3. 19. Dan. 9. 24.*

For a Conclusion of this Chapter, I would briefly shew,

---

\* Those who desire to understand more of this Matter, I refer to this Book.



shew, what is the main essential Difference between the Law, and the Gospel. For I take it to be of very great Concernment rightly to distinguish between these.

The Gospel then is sometimes taken for the Times of the new Testament. But it must not be so confin'd: For the Gospel was preached before to Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. and before that to Adam, Gen. 3. 15. which is rightly call'd *πρωταγγελιον*, the first Gospel, Sometimes it is taken more largely, for the whole Doctrine preached by Christ and his Apostles, including Repentance unto Life, Faith in Jesus Christ, with all that spiritual Obedience unto God, required of Believers. But if we do more narrowly distinguish it from the Law, (which is necessary to be done, or else we understand not what we mean by either) It is a Doctrine of Grace, revealing Jesus Christ, and his Righteousness, holding forth a Promise of Christ, and the Spirit, of Grace, and Glory to the Heirs of Salvation, Rom. 1. 16, 17. Heb. 8. 10, 11, 12. The Gospel preached to Adam, and afterwards to Abraham, was no other than a free Promise; and the Promise of Christ contain'd a Promise of all things pertaining to, and accompanying Salvation. I cannot but think, we may very much learn what the Nature of the Gospel is, and what Doctrine is suitable to the Relief of Fallen Man, from the first gracious Declaration of God to Adam.

On the other hand, The Law consists of Commandments, with Promises of Life to the Doer, and Threatenings of Death and Damnation to him that fails in any one Point. \* So that as there is much Gospel running thro' the Old Testament in Promises, Types, and Prophecies;

C 2

---

\* For other particular Differences, I refer to Mr. Taylor's Book, Entitled, *The Law established by the Gospel*, c. 3. p. 23. to p. 41.

phesies; so there is much of the *Law* contain'd in the New Testament. The clear Apprehension of these things is very necessary for the right understanding of the Doctrine of free Justification, and of the Way of Salvation by Jesus Christ: For which Reason I have mention'd them in this place.

But it will be *Objected*, That the Gospel also hath *Precepts*; particularly that Faith and Repentance must needs belong thereto, as not being requir'd of sinless Man; and that God calls upon Man to repent and believe; surely this is Gospel.

*Answer*, That the Moral Law, as given on Mount Sinai to Man, when in a *Fallen State*, required Faith on Christ, and Repentance from dead Works, is clear beyond a modest Denial: else it fail'd in a principal Part of that *inward Worship*, which we owe to God, as our Redeemer. For thus he reveal'd himself, and thus he prefaced his Law, *I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the Land of Egypt. Our God and Redeemer.* I confess these Duties are call'd for, on a Gospel-ground, and on a Supposal of Gospel-Grace before reveal'd, and were also contain'd in the first Promise, but are commanded in the Law. Again, when God had reveal'd himself in a Way of Mercy, and had promis'd the Saviour to our first Parents; I would ask, whether upon this Revelation, the Law of Creation did not oblige Man to believe in the Promise, and the Saviour therein reveal'd, and also to repent of his Sin (which indeed he ought to have done, whether there had been any Promise or no) without any new Law given to that End? I am confident a Denial of this cannot be defended. \* These Duties therefore are not required in the

---

\* See that accurate Book of Mr. Taylor, before quoted, p. 25. The coming forth of which was one Reason of the Delay of this.

the Law by way of *Consequence*, and *remotely*, as some other Duties which are of *positive* Institution ; as that whole \* Frame of Worship under the Law, viz. Circumcision, Passover, Sacrifices, &c. and the present Frame of Worship under the Gospel, as Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Matters relating to Discipline and Order. I marvel Men have not framed their New Law out of these things, which the Law could not have obliged to, unless *mediate Lege positivâ*, by the Interposition of a positive Command. If these Laws were duly observed, we should have more Church-work and Gospel-order, than generally is to be found among those who speak most of the New Law, yea, or those who profess most of Church-work, and walking according to Gospel-rule. But, I say, the Law of Creation oblig'd *fallen Adam directly and immediate'y* to believe in Christ, and to repent of Sin, at least, *Mediante promissione*, so soon as there was a Revelation of Gospel-Grace.

Now that this is no new Doctrine, see a full and large Testimony of the Learned † *Chemnitius*, which I think very proper to insert here: Unto this Question, *Qua sit propria Evangelii Doctrina?* What is the Doctrine proper to the Gospel? He answers, *Multa sunt Scriptura Testimonia, &c.* 'There are many Testimonies of Scripture, which manifestly affirm, that the Doctrine of Justification before God is to be learn'd and fetch'd, not from the Law, but from the Gospel, *Rom. 1. 16, 17. c. 3. 21. c. 4. 13, &c.* Also that the Object of justifying Faith, is not the Doctrine of the Law, but the Voice of the Gospel, which therefore is called the Law, *C 3*

\* The Ceremonial Laws are to be refer'd to the Second Commandment. *Matter on the Types*, p. 53. Reprinted, 1795.  
† *Chemnitii, Lsc. Theolog. pars sec. de Loco Justif. Edit. mibi 8vo. p. 538. Francofurti, 1603.*

' Law and Word of Faith. Therefore we must de-  
 ' termine from evident and firm Testimonies of Scri-  
 ' pture, what is the proper Doctrine of the Gospel  
 ' (which must be separated from the Law) reveal-  
 ' ing the Righteousness of Faith before God, which  
 ' Faith imbraces and apprehends unto Righteousness  
 ' and eternal Life.—And then he admonishes, ' How  
 ' pernicious Mistakes in all Times have happen'd in  
 ' the Article of Justification, even from hence, that  
 ' it was not rightly judg'd from true Foundations,  
 ' what is the proper Doctrine of the Gospel, in  
 ' which Faith ought to seek Righteousness before  
 ' God. A little after he sheweth, ' That some feign'd  
 ' this Difference, between the Law and Gospel,  
 ' that the Law, now after the Revelation of the  
 ' Gospel, doth therefore not justify, because it de-  
 ' liver'd imperfect Precepts, concerning external  
 ' good Works, to be perform'd from Fear, and had  
 ' only Corporal and Temporal Promises; but that  
 ' in the *New Law*, there are more perfect, excellent,  
 ' and severe Precepts, which might bring Righte-  
 ' ousness to the Doers, &c. If it be asked, what  
 ' therefore doth Faith? They answer'd, it believes  
 ' those things are true, which are written in the new  
 ' Law. But what doth Christ? Some (*i. e. Papists*)  
 ' say, that *he only brought these new Precepts*: Others,  
 ' who attribute a little more to Christ, that he gives  
 ' us that Grace, by which we might fulfil the Pre-  
 ' cepts, and by them obtain Righteousness, and eter-  
 ' nal Life. But *Paul* expressly denies, that Christ  
 ' came that we might be justify'd by Commandments  
 ' of Works. And afterward, ' This Foundation is  
 ' manifest; that the Righteousness of God, without  
 ' the Law, is reveal'd in the Gospel. If therefore  
 ' this which they define is the proper Doctrine of the  
 ' Gospel, it follows, that the Righteousness of Faith  
 ' consists not only in the Application of the free Pro-  
 ' mise,



'mise, concerning the Remission of Sins, for the  
 'sake of the Mediator; but also that Newness  
 '[of Life] or good Works is a substantial part of  
 'it. And our Adversaries the Papists do well consi-  
 'der this; therefore they seek various Depravations,  
 'that they may confound, obscure, and take away this  
 'necessary Distinction, what is the proper Doctrine of the  
 'Gospel, making known the Righteousness of Faith before  
 'God. For they see that this is the shortest way;  
 'for if it be determin'd that the Doctrine proper to  
 'the Gospel, is not only concerning Faith of the  
 'free Promise, but also concerning Renovation or  
 'good Works, then presently it will follow, that  
 'also good Works do enter our Justification, as a  
 'partial Cause; because that **IN THE GOSPEL,**  
 'is reveal'd the Righteousness of God. Here he quotes  
 'a Passage of Luther, on Gal. 2. 14. He who well  
 'knows to distinguish the Law from the Gospel, let  
 'him give Thanks to God, and let him know that  
 'he is a Divine. I certainly in Temptation did not  
 'yet know it, as I ought. *And,* Thou shouldest as  
 'diligently distinguish the Righteousness of the  
 'Gospel, from the Righteousness of the Law, as  
 'thou dost distinguish Heaven from Earth, &c. And  
 'what other Light (*said our Author*) hath disperfed  
 'the grossest Darkness of the Popish Kingdom, but  
 'this chiefly, which hath demonstrated the true Diffe-  
 'rence of the Law and Gospel. Here he proceed-  
 'eth excellently to give the Differences, which the  
 'Learned may peruse; and perhaps there is no Man  
 'so learned, but it may be profitable to him so to do.  
 'He further teacheth, 'that altho' in the Doctrine of  
 'Christ, and the Apostles, many Sermons are found  
 'concerning Sin, and good Works, yet this is not  
 'the proper Doctrine of the Gospel, as it is distin-  
 'guished from the Law, but the Precepts of the  
 'Law are repeated in the preaching of the Gospel.

Notwithstanding he doth not reject, but explain, the usual Definition, that the Gospel is the preaching of Repentance, and Remission of Sins. He Disputeth, that those who contend that the Gospel, properly so called, doth not only contain the Promise of Grace, but also the Doctrine of Good Works, such do not understand what they say; for thus the Difference of the Law and Gospel, is confounded, which the Apostle doth so Establish, and the Gospel is transformed into a Law. And these Foundations being plucked up, the Purity of the Doctrine concerning Justification can't consist. He also mentions *Melancthon*, who (saith he) admonishes, that altho' in the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, there are many Sermons of Repentance, and of the Law, yet it is another Question, What is the Doctrine proper to the Gospel, and to be separated from the Law? And *Luther*, on *Gal. 2.* that Commandments are found in the Gospel, these do not belong to the Gospel, but are Expositions of the Law, and Appendices of the Gospel.

This was the Doctrine which those Reformers, tho' necessary to preach and defend against the Papists, who set up their own Works and Righteousness, confounded Law and Gospel, and taught the Law instead of the Gospel. Here then the Reader may see, that these Controversies were agitated long ago, between the Protestants and the Papists, which of late have been unhappily revived among our selves.

Let me make these things a little practical, by a Word or two of Use.

1. Tell me, you that desire to be under the Law, do you not hear the Law? *Gal. 4. 21.* Do you not hear what it requires? Those who were saved under the Law, were saved by the Promise, or Covenant of Grace,

Grace, with *Abraham*. Therefore no Man can be saved by a Law, but by Promise, and Free Grace. For if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise, Gal. 3. 18. The Law, and Promise, are distinguished, and opposed; that wherever you bring in a Law, you exclude the Promise.

2. Here see the need of a Mediator. If the Law requires perfect Obedience, what will you do without one? what will you do without his Righteousness? Beg as *Israel* did, that the Word may not be spoken by an absolute God. It is sad, if thou takest that to be a Law of Grace, which if thou attemptest to keep as such, will tear the Caul of thine Heart to pieces! The Thunder of Mount *Sinai* will strike thee dead; this fiery Law will burn thee up! O! then come unto Mount *Sion*, to *Jesus the Mediator*, and to the blood of sprinkling; where you will bless God for ever, not for a new Law, but for the new Covenant, even a Covenant of Promise.

## CHAP. II.

Shewing, That the Rule of Obedience, or Duty, and the Rule of Righteousness for Justification, are the same.

Obedience, and Righteousness, in the matter of Justification, are the same. The *New Methodists*, for ought I can perceive, are at a loss whether they shall say, that the Law abates of its Requirements, and that the Demands thereof are not now so high, as to require a perfect Obedience: Or, whether they

they shall say, that it doth indeed require the same, and that still perfect Obedience is *Duty*; but it doth not insist upon it, as the *Condition of Justification*; it doth accept of lower Terms, notwithstanding what it may demand, as *Duty*. They speak indeed of a *New Law*, which is the *Rule of Righteousness*, while the *Old* perhaps may be allowed to be the *Rule of Duty*. But their new *Law* (if such a *Law* there be) makes the other *Old*, and disannuls it: For it is destructive of, and contrary to it. For, can we be under two *Laws* at the same time, so *Essentially* different, the one requiring *Perfection*, the other accepting of an *Imperfect Righteousness* of our own, instead of a *Perfect*? They hold, that the *New Law* condescends to lower and milder Terms than the *Old*. Now, let me ask, Whether it be milder in *Demands*, or only in its *Acceptation*, as to *Justification*? If they say, in *Demands*, it requires not so much as the old *Law* did: Then the *Will of God*, reveal'd in his *Law*, is not *Unchangeable*; yea, then here is a *Law of God* that don't so much as require *Perfection* in *Obedience*; and no *Man* can certainly say, what *Imperfection* it will admit of, or what *Obedience* it will accept; and lastly, then the *Old Law* is disannull'd, and made void thereby. If they say, the *Demands* are the same, but it *Accepts* of less: Verily then there is no *New Law*, in *Point of Duty*, or *Commandments of Duty*, and consequently it is no *Law*. It cannot be a *Law of Righteousness*, but only a *Rule of Acceptation*, wherein *God* sets out what he will accept of; a *Law* that *God* hath made to himself (as I may say) to deal with *Men* upon lower Terms than his *Law* at first requir'd. Here is the *Dilemma*, let them take which part they please, the *Truth* is strongest, and will prevail. Therefore this shall be my present *Work*, to evince that the *Law* at first given



to Man, is the Rule of that Righteousness whereby we must be justified, as well as the Rule of our Duty and Obedience. This I shall confirm, 1. By some Reasons.

2. By Scripture.

I. For Reasons.

1. It is unworthy of God, unworthy of his Divine Perfections, to imagine that he should give one Law as a Rule of Obedience, and another as a Rule of Righteousness for Justification. For,

(1.) This seemeth not agreeable to the Infinite Wisdom and Foresight of God. Men make Laws, and are forced to alter them, because they do not fore-see all Events; but herein appears the Wisdom of the great Law-giver, and the Glory of his Law, that he gave one Law once for all, which should stand for ever, into whatsoever State and Condition Man should come, both while Innocent, when Full, and when Recover'd. Herein is the Admirable Divine Perfection of God's Law; and herein it is a fit Representation of the Unchangeable Mind, and Will of God.

(2.) The Infinite Justice, and Holiness of God, would not admit of any thing less than a perfect, and every way compleat Righteousness, wherein to justify a Sinner. In justifying, he must shew forth the Righteousness, and Holiness of his Nature, Rom. 3. 25, 26. A Righteousness answerable to what is required in his Law, could do this, and nothing short thereof. Memorable are the Words of Calvin to this purpose. \* First let us consider, (saith he)

\* Instit. 1. 3. c. 12. § 1. Principio ergo nobis succurrat illud, &c.

' that we Discourse not concerning the Righteousness  
 ' of an Human Court, but of the Heavenly Tribu-  
 ' nal, that we may not judge by our own poor Mea-  
 ' sure, by what Integrity of Works the Divine Ju-  
 ' stice may be satisfied. It is marvelous with what  
 ' Rashness and Boldness, that is commonly defined.  
 ' And you may see that none do talk more confident-  
 ' ly and largely, concerning the Righteousness of  
 ' Works, than they who are either openly Wicked,  
 ' or do harbour secret Vices. This cometh to pass,  
 ' because they think not of the Righteousness of God,  
 ' whereof if they had but the least Sense, they would  
 ' never make such a sport of it. But certainly it is  
 ' beyond Measure despised, if it is not acknowledg-  
 ' ed *such*, and *so perfect*, that nothing can be accepted  
 ' thereby, but that which is *Perfect*, and in every  
 ' part compleat, and defiled with no spot, such as  
 ' never was, nor ever shall be found in Man. It is  
 ' easie indeed, and ready at hand to every one, to  
 ' trifle in the Shades of the Schools, concerning the  
 ' Worthiness of Works to justify Men: But when  
 ' we must come into the sight of God, such Trifles  
 ' must be dismissed, because there the matter is treat-  
 ' ed seriously, and is not managed with a vain strife  
 ' of Words. Hither! hither our Minds must be  
 ' carry'd, if we would enquire concerning true  
 ' Righteousness with profit; how we may answer  
 ' the Heavenly Judge, when he shall call us to an ac-  
 ' count? Let us set that Judge before us, not *such* as  
 ' our Understandings do naturally imagine, but *such*  
 ' as he is described to us in the Scripture, *viz.* by  
 ' whose Brightness the Stars are darken'd; by whose  
 ' strength the Mountains are dissolved; by whose  
 ' Anger the Earth is shaken; by whose Wisdom the  
 ' Prudent are taken in their own Craft; before whose  
 ' Purity all things are defiled; whose Righteousness  
 ' the Angels are not able to bear; — whose Wrath  
 ' pierceth

pierceth to the lowest Hell. If he sit, I say, to examine the Deeds of Men, who shall stand secure at his Throne? *Isa. 33. 14.* — *He who walketh in Righteousness, and speaketh Truth.* But let him come forth, whosoever he is. Yea, but that Answer hinders; for against him a terrible Voice soundeth, 'If thou, Lord, shouldest mark Iniquity, O Lord, who shall stand? *Pf. 130. 3.* — In the Angels he finds Pravity, and the Heavens are not clean in his sight, *Job 4. 17. c. 15. 15.*

(3.) *The Truth and Faithfulness of God, will not admit of any thing less than a Perfect Righteousness for Justification.* When he hath once said, These are the Terms of Life and Happiness to Man, and he who falls short is Cursed; *Gal 3. 10.* \* surely it cannot be that he should go back, make abatement, or come to a composition. This Law did not attain its End in our Primitive State, which was Obedience; yet this End must be attained, if Sinners are saved, and the Threatning must take place, that the Truth of God might be secured. But to press the matter closer; *What was the Reason that God would give a Law (Exod. 20.) after Man was fallen, requiring Perfect Obedience, to love God with all our Heart, and our Neighbour as our selves; forbidding all manner of Stirrings and Motions of the Heart, contrary to this Law, as Sinful, if he intended to justify and save him by a lesser Obedience than what was required in this Law? Surely, He would only have given to fallen Man, the Law suitable to his State, and which he intended to save him by, and not that Law which he had broken, and never could fulfil; unless He intended It should some way or other be fulfilled.* Neither indeed could this Law be of absolute, and invariable Truth, saying,

---

\* Vid. *Tullij* *Justit. Paulin. c. c. p. 85.*

saying, *thou shalt do so, and thou shalt not do so; and the Man that doth them shall live in them, and Cursed is the Man that continues not in all things, &c.* Rom. 10. 5. Gal. 3. 10. if God did, and did intend to, accept of something else, of something *less* than what was here required, what was this Law given for? Certain it is, that Man could not obey it. For it must be remember'd, it was given to *fallen* Creatures. The principal Reasons were, to discover what was that Obedience, which we ought to yield in our own Persons; And to be the Rule and Measure of the Mediator's Obedience. Where can the Truth of God be secured but in *Christ*? If God could consistently with his Truth and Holiness have abated any thing, He would have accepted of the *Active Obedience, and Intercession of Christ*, ( Let me say, these were worth more than all the World, and all the Righteousness of it ) and have abated him his Dying.

( 4. ) This Imagination of a New Law, as the Rule of a Justifying Righteousness, *hath but an un-  
toward Aspect upon God's Unchangeableness.* For, He is of one Mind, and who can turn him? Job 23. 13. He never asks higher that he will take, nor stoops to lower Terms than he asked. He entirely secures the Honour of his Holiness, the Glory of his Law, and all his Perfections, in Justifying; Isa. 42. 21. which is done by Jesus Christ our Lord.

2. In JESUS CHRIST, Obedience and Righteousness are one and the same thing, and the Law was the Rule thereof. If then we are Justified by Christ's Righteousness, and He fulfilled the same Law which is the Rule of our Duty; it is one and the same Law which is the Measure of a Justifying Righteousness; and the Rule of our Duty. But this will be afterward spoken to, if God will.

II. For



II. For the Confirmation of this Point by *Scripture*. Consider *Mat. 5. 19, 20. Whosoever shall break one of these least Commandments, which he may think to be the least, or in the least and lowest Instance, in the Thought, or secret Motion of the Heart; and shall teach Men so, either by teaching a pretended Gospel-Liberty, that we are not under the Law as a Rule; or by Teaching, that there is an Abatement made in what the Law required, that it is not so strict as to extend to the inward Frames of the Heart, or the like; He shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven; if he have any part therein, yet he comes off with loss. But whosoever shall do, and teach them, shall be called great, &c.* That Jesus Christ both did and taught them, even to Perfection, and in Purity, cannot be deny'd, He therefore above all Others is GREAT indeed in the Kingdom of Heaven. But so far as any of his Servants do *delight in the Law of God after the inner Man, and do, and teach it in Purity, They also shall be called Great according to their Measure, and the Grace they have received. V. 20. For I say unto you, that except your Righteousness exceed, &c. q. d. your Righteousness must be without any Breach of the least Commandment; it must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, else ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* The Law must therefore be fulfill'd by Another for us. For verily as to all the External of Religion, it will be a hard matter for any Man to exceed some of the Scribes and Pharisees. Yea, and in outward Conversation, some of the Saints have miscarry'd at a greater rate than many of them. It will be said, *They wanted Sincerity, and were but meer Hypocrites, and so every true Christian doth exceed them.* I answer, in many of them there was not (I conceive) a gross Hypocrisie; they did not intend to Deceive, but verily aim'd at keeping of the Law, and

and attaining Righteousness, *Rom. 9. 31. c. 10. 2.* But, I take it, Christ's meaning is, You must have a Righteousness that shall excel theirs *materially*, in all the several Acts of Obedience to the Commands thereof. As in the matter of Abstinence from Anger, from Adultery, from Revenge, and the like; in which respect they might attain as far as any Christian ordinarily doth attain, and yet it was unavailable; there must be a Righteousness more perfect still, answerable to what he said before, *v. 18.* God will abate nothing. For, Christ having said this, proceeds to give such an Account of the *Spirituality* and *Perfection* of the Law, as has already been declared. Now then, when Christ had said, *Your Righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes, &c.* and then goes on to tell them, that the Law forbids every *sinful Motion*, and requires *Perfection*; is it not clearly to say, that the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, whereon they trusted, was short and insufficient on this account; because *it did not come up to this Purity and Perfection of the Law*? So that it was not insufficient only, as a *Meetness* for Heaven, because they wanted *Truth of Grace*, but as a *Title* to the Kingdom, on a *Reason common* to them with the best Christians whatsoever. But Christ instanceth in *them*, because they were look'd upon in that Day as Men of highest Attainments. Again, when he tells them, that the Righteousness of the Pharisees was insufficient, because it did not come up to the Perfection of the Law; and withal tells them, that they must have a better Righteousness: Is it not clearly to say, that *they must have a Righteousness answerable to this Law of God, thus spiritually Interpreted*? Or else whatsoever Righteousness they should make mention of, would leave them short of Heaven at last.

See

See another Scripture, viz. *Gal. 3. 21.* *If there had been a Law given, which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law.* The Apostle here saith, That neither the Law of *Moses*, nor any Law which had been yet given, could give Life; and that therefore a justifying Righteousness could not be by any Law. Now what was the Reason the Law could not give Life? I answer, *It was weak through the Flesh, Rom. 8. 3.* *Faln Man* could not fulfil it. And why could they not fulfil it? Because it would not accept a short, imperfect Performance, as a Righteousness; but required *Perfection*: Else it might have been done, as well as Men can now fulfil the Law of Grace, as they think. There was *no* Law therefore under the *Old Testament*, by which Men were, or could be saved. The *Sinai Law* it self (which was as much a Law of Grace as any other) could not give Life. Then neither are *New-Testament* Believers saved by a Remedial Law, seeing the Way of Salvation is *One*, from the Beginning to the End of the World. So that that Righteousness whereby we must be justified, must compleatly answer the Law in its highest Demands, and utmost Extent. For what if having observed all other Commands of God exactly; so much as *one Title* of the Law is neglected by thee; \* What will thy Righteousness say to us in this Case? Do you not see that the Sentence of the Law being pronounced, you are as much in the fault; as if you were guilty of all Unrighteousness?

I confess, this account of things will bring in *All the World for Sinners*. And I am willing to be found of that Number, as *Paul* was, of whom I am chief, *1 Tim. 1. 15.* that I may have a part in that faithful and acceptable Saying, *That Christ Jesus came into the World to save Sinners.*

---

\* Fox on Just. against *Osovius*. English Translation, p. 20

Let this Doctrine then be improved,

1. For *Humiliation*; to humble thee for thine infinite short coming. And let those who talk of their *New-Law-Sincerity*, look to it, that they have Sincerity indeed; for they will *one Day* find it true, that nothing else will pass for Sincerity, than for a Sinner, one who is on all Accounts so, and as such, to trust alone in Christ's Righteousness, because in himself he is wholly lost. Thus the Pride of all Self-Righteousness is brought down. All *sincere Endeavours* (as they are taken to be) to receive Christ as a *Law-giver*, and *King*, and to keep the Law, *which flow not from such a Faith in Christ the Saviour*, will be accounted *Insincerity*; and therefore can be no mark of Sincerity. *Plainness is best in Matters of Eternal Consequence*. What true Gospel-Sincerity is, see in *Hab. 2. 4.* and *Phil. 3. 3.*

2. For *Holiness*. If the Law require Perfection of Obedience, what manner of Persons ought we to be, who profess Faith in Christ? Our Lord Jesus, in *Mat. 5. 19. 29, 30, 45.* not only teaches what the Law requires for a *justifying Righteousness*, but also recommends a very high Regard to this Law of God in a way of *Duty*. For seeing the Law of God is so Sacred, that it must be perfectly fulfill'd, and Christ did fulfil it; every *Christian* ought to have the greatest Respect to all its *Commands*, and to the Example of the Lord Jesus.



## C H A P. III.

*Shewing, That faln Man, both as in the Fall, and when recover'd, is utterly unable to answer the Demands of the Law, or fulfil such a Righteousness, as it requires unto Justification.*

**I**F it be Truth, which hath already been proved, That the Law of God condemns, as Sinful, all the Lustings of the Heart to that which is evil; and as a Rule of Obedience, requires perfect Holiness, then it cannot be deny'd, that faln Sinners cannot fulfil this Law themselves, without denying that we are Sinners, which would be to Deny the whole Scripture, See *Eccles. 7. and 20. 29. 1 Joh. 1. 10.* If be said, *They may fulfil the New Law, and so be justify'd*: This Objection is already prevented, by shewing in the foregoing Chapter, That no other Righteousness can justify, than that which answered the *Old and Perfect Law of God.*

The *Papists* talk at that rate, That the Unregenerate cannot fulfil the Law, but the Regenerate, by the help of the Spirit of God, can fulfil all Righteousness; at least what is necessary to justify, by the Works of the Law; whom I shall not stand to confute, since that famous Martyrologist Mr. *Fox*, hath well done it already, *ubi. sup. p. 155, &c.*

I need not be large upon this Head, for that those with whose Doctrine I am concerned, will own the Truth of it; as to the old Law, which (according to them) God insisteth not on as the Rule or Measure of a Justifying Righteousness: But as to the

New Law, the Fulfilling whereof by us is that (according to them) which God insisteth on; they will not say, That we are unable to answer the Demands thereof, or to fulfil such a Righteousness as it requires unto Justification. Hence it is they seem to doubt, whether they shall call it an *Imperfect* Obedience and Righteousness or not. For Sincerity is the Perfection thereof. And therefore

*Obj.* It may be such Scriptures will be objected here as these, *viz.* *Mat.* 19. 17. *If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments.* And *Rom.* 2. 13. *Not the Hearers of the Law are just before God, but the Doers of the Law shall be justify'd,* v. 26. *If the Uncircumcision keep the Righteousness of the Law, &c.* From whence it may seem to some, (1) That it is by a *Personal* Obedience of our own, that we must go to Heaven. (2.) That therefore there is such a thing as *keeping the Commandments*, if not to absolute Perfection, yet to such a Degree as is required, or at least accepted of God, by a *Remedial* Law; for that he will accept of a sincere Desire and Endeavour to perform them. So that a Man may fulfil the Commands, and come up to the Terms of the new Law, unto Justification.

*Ans.* I begin with that Text in *Matthew*. The young Man who there came to Christ, was one of those who had a Zeal of God, and made Conscience of keeping the Law, who was (as the generality of the Jews in that Day were) *following after Righteousness by the Works of the Law*, and thought that his own Doings and Obedience would carry him to Heaven. 'Therefore the Design of our Saviour in his Answer, 'was not to shew him the way, by which it was 'possible, that he, or any other, might come to 'Heaven, but only to convince him of the Errors of 'the Pharisaical Doctrine. They taught Eternal 'Life to be attainable by the Works of the Law, 'and

‘and by a fulfilling thereof, according to that imperfect Sense they gave of it, of which we have heard;  
 ‘*Char. 5.* The Way to Eternal Life (saith he) according to your Doctrine, is plain before you.  
 ‘You say Men may perfectly keep the Commandments of God, he that doeth so shall be saved;  
 ‘therefore keep the Commandments. Not that our  
 ‘Saviour thought he could do it, or that there did  
 ‘lie a passable Road to Heaven that way, but that he  
 ‘might convince him of his Error, and the need he  
 ‘had of a Saviour. *Pool's Engl. Annot.*

Further, (I conceive) Christ's Design was to discover the ignorant Opinion which he had of his own keeping the Law, by drawing forth that Answer which he next made, *v. 20.* *All these have I kept, &c.* Knowing therefore what was in Man, he makes trial of him in one thing, *v. 21.* *Go sell that thou hast and give to the Poor, &c.* to discover how little there was of Love either to God, or his Neighbour; and also to hint the true Way of Salvation, by believing on himself.

In the second Text, *viz. Rom. 2. 13.* ‘The Scope of the Apostle is not simply to shew how Sinners are now justify'd in the Sight of God, but to shew what is requisite to Justification, according to the Tenor of the Law; and that is, to do all that is written therein, and to continue so to do; and if there be any Man that can bring such constant, and perfect Obedience of his own performing, he shall be justify'd by God; but in as much as no Man, neither Natural, nor Regenerate, can so fulfil the Law, he must seek for Justification in some other Way. The Text thus expounded is no way at Variance with *Rom. 3. 20.* and *Gal. 3. 11.* which at first reading it might seem to be. *Pool's Engl. Annot.*  
 Again ,

Again, *Rom. 2. 25, 26. Circumcision verily profiteth; if thou keep the Law; if thou dost it perfectly, to which indeed Circumcision obliged; but thus no Man ever kept it, save Jesus Christ: Or, if thou dost it sincerely, that is, from a Gospel Principle, and Motive, to a Gospel End, v. 26. If the Uncircumcision, that is, the uncircumcised Man, keep the Righteousness of the Law; if after the inner Man, he delight in the Law of God, (which he only can do, who by Faith seeks a justifying Righteousness in Christ) and keep the Law in a Measure, according to the Grace received, shall not his Uncircumcision be counted for Circumcision? He is in as good a State as he that is Circumcised. But then, this keeping of the Law is not for Justification. The Obedience of a Believer is accepted, but not as the fulfilling of the Law, not as a justifying Righteousness, not as going before Justification, but as following it.*

If it be still said, *A Man may, and Believers do fulfil the Commands of the Gospel-Law. I ask, whether they do perfectly so, or only in part? Whether their Sincerity it self is Perfect, or Imperfect? If they say, Imperfect, I reply, Then it cannot justify it self at God's Bar, and therefore cannot justify their Persons. If it be not perfect, according to the Measure and Requirements of this Remedial Law, it doth not then come up to the Terms of it; and if it falls short here, it cannot justify by any Law. The very Sincerity of a Believer is imperfect, as well as other Graces. Their Heart is Deceitful, and Sin is Deceitful, and every Sin in the Believer is so much Guile. Thou sayest, Thou lovest God, if not perfectly, yet sincerely: But according to thy unrenewed Part, thou lovest that which he hateth. Where is now perfect Sincerity? Thou sayest, Thou keepest that Command, Thou shalt not kill, sincerely, and in desire; yet thou art many a time grievously angry withou*



without a Cause. And so in that *thou shalt not Covet* or any other Instance, there are contrary Lustings and Desires in thee. Where then is perfect Sincerity? O prize Christ's Righteousness! Thine own comes off with Imperfection still. If (on the other Hand) they say their Sincerity and Obedience is *Perfect*, according to this new Law, which is the Rule of it. Who shall know that? There are Degrees of Grace and Holiness in Christians. Now if the highest exceed not, the lowest must fall short; if the lowest fall not short, the highest must have something of Supererogation. Thus when Men go from God's Standard, they have none left. Keep we Sincerity under the Head of *Sanctification*, and we have not these Difficulties, but bring it into your *Justification*, and it must perfectly answer the Rule thereof. And if any Man perfectly keep that Law which he is under, and is to be justify'd by, be it what it will, he hath kept the Law of God, and is without Sin as to that Law. \* Again, Doth the Law of Grace take in the Ten Commandments within the Compass of it, that we may know what to say to it? If not, that Law hath not God's Authority, and is of little Concern to us, which leaves out all the Duties of the Ten Commandments. It is a *very mild* one indeed. If it doth, it is the same which was from the Beginning, and takes in all the Duties arising from the Relation of God and Man, in the utmost Latitude.

But know, O Soul, there is but One Invariable, Eternal Law of God, the Rule and Standard of all Righteousness, and Measure of Sin; whereto the Apostle opposeth *the Gospel*, Gal. 1. 6. *the Promise*, Gal. 3. 18, 21. *Grace and Truth*, Joh. 1. 17. In

---

\* If our Obedience do answer the only Law, and Rule of it, then is there no Sin in us, nor need of Pardon. *Origin of Justification*. p. 335.

like manner, the *Ministration of Death*, and the *Ministration of the Spirit*, are opposed; that is, the *Law* and the *Gospel*; the one is a *Ministration of Condemnation*, the other of *Righteousness*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 8, 9. Rom. 10 5, 6. Also, the *Righteousness of the Law*, and the *Righteousness which is by Faith*.

‘ This Law no meer Man, since the Fall, can in  
 ‘ this Life perfectly keep; but daily doth break in  
 ‘ Thought, Word and Deed, (*Assemb. Catech.*)  
 And as for a Law of Grace, I read of none in God’s  
 Word; but of the Gospel of Grace I read, *Act.* 20.  
 24. We must look for a *Remedy*, not to any *Law*,  
 but to the *Gospel*, to the *Promise*, to *Grace*. GRACE,  
 I say, not only delivering from *Hell*, but also from  
*Sin*, and constraining to Obedience. ‘ For what is  
 ‘ more excellent than *Righteousness*, in the whole Na-  
 ‘ ture of Divine and Humane Things, which com-  
 ‘ prehendeth in the Compass of it, all kind of Virtues,  
 ‘ the highest Perfection of the Law, and also the  
 ‘ perfect Image of God? It may indeed be found in  
 ‘ Heaven, but on Earth it cannot be found. There  
 ‘ had been no need for God to justify us by *Faith*, if  
 ‘ we could be justify’d by *Works*. And, if God hath  
 ‘ commanded what cannot be kept by us, it is not  
 ‘ thro’ any Default of his, but thro’ our own. *For*  
 ‘ *ubi sup.* p. 5. and 98.

CHAP.

## C H A P. IV.

*Shewing, That Jesus Christ, as Surety for the Elect, hath in their stead Fulfilled the Law, as a Rule of Righteousness for Justification, and born the Penalty or Curse due for the Transgression of it.*

**I** Hope I have made good my Ground hitherto; and if it be Truth, 1. That the Law still requires perfect Obedience. 2. That God will have his Law fulfill'd, and a Righteousness answerable thereto, to justify a Sinner. 3. That no Man at present can fulfil it, or work out such a Righteousness: Then it will follow, either that no Man can be justify'd and saved; or else that Jesus Christ, as Surety, hath fulfill'd the Law, and satisfy'd Justice for the Elect. Unto this, all that hath been spoken tends, and in this it centers. And on the other hand, all that is said of a *Milder Law*, and Gospel-Works for *Justification*, tends to the Subversion of this Truth, and it is this which they aim at. Wherefore, altho' in the Defence of the fore-going Truths, *this* is established; and the Opposition thereto is defeated, by taking away the Foundation of a New Law; yet, because there are particular Cavils and Exceptions, raised against this most sweet and precious Truth of the Gospel, I do (with Divine Help) joyfully undertake the Defence of it, under these Heads. 1. That Jesus Christ obey'd the *Precept* of the Law, for the Elect. 2. That he suffer'd the *Penalty* thereof for them. 3. That he did both as *Surety*.

I. *That*

I. *That the Lord Jesus Christ obey'd the Precept of the Law for the Elect.* He kept the *Commandments for them.* This is usually call'd the *Active Obedience* of Christ.

Mr. *Clark* the Annotator, in a Book of his, \* denies Christ's Obeying the Law for us, and the Imputation of his *Active Obedience*, which he excludes from having an Interest in our Justification, and asserts, that Christ did all for us by his Sufferings, and by a low and forced Sense (as I take it) put upon many Texts of Scripture, which advance and magnify the Righteousness of Jesus Christ, he makes neither him, nor any thing in him, to be our *very* Righteousness, but only *Meritorious*, that our Gospel-Works shall be accepted for Righteousness. For he puts no more upon *his Sufferings* than this, ' That they are a valuable Consideration for the Transgression of the first Covenant, or Law of Works, ' so that God may now, without any Disparagement ' to his Justice, or any of his Attributes, make a ' new Covenant upon more gentle and condescending ' Terms, peculiarly fitted and suited to the State of ' lapsed Mankind, &c. p. 24.

I know not what he may expect, but cannot think that one who disputes against the Honour of our Lord Jesus, excluding his *Active Obedience*, abusing his Righteousness to such a Degree, should have any Praise from him for so doing. For my part, I desire not to be found without a Part in Christ's *Active Obedience*, when he comes, let who will boast of their Gospel-Works. Howbeit, in the End of his Book, he would bring in the *Active Obedience* again, and after he had by divers Arguments (which are dire-

---

\* Intituled, *Scripture Justification*, Printed 1698. which has been well answered by Mr. *Chauncy*; but because I find it has done hurt, I thought something further not unnecessary.



cted, not only against its being consider'd *separately*, but against its being *fulfilled in our stead*) excluded it, then he tells us, it is to be included in the *Passive*. Wherein if he means by the Active Obedience of Christ, his *Obeying the Precept* of the Law, he plainly contradicts himself; seeing he had before excluded it, in *Comparison* with his Sufferings. But perhaps he means only his *Activeness in Suffering*; and if so, he goes about to deceive and blind the Eyes of his Reader. True, Christ was Active in Suffering, which made his Sufferings properly Obedience; but was there not Obedience to the Law, which is distinct enough from Suffering of the Penalty? Or, Are not *Adam's* Obedience in Innocency, and the *Damned's* Suffering in Hell, Things distant and different enough to be distinguished? Altho' in the Life of Christ, *suffering* was mixed with *Doing* throughout; and He was in the highest Sense *Active* in his Sufferings; yet these things must not be confounded. His Suffering was a *quodam agente*, from without, from the Hand of God, of Men, or Devils: His Obedience was *ab interno Principio*, from the Law *within*, written in his Heart. Therefore *Doing* and *Suffering*, as they are in two different Categories, so in Christ they are very clearly distinct. For altho' in the great Effects of our Justification and Salvation, they have a *joint* Influence; and Men may be too curious in assigning their distinct Efficacy: Yet I think this Difference must be allowed, that the Active Obedience of Christ cannot properly be said to be *Satisfactory* to Justice, for the *Offence* by Sin. And again, \* 'Suffering for Punishment gives *Right* and *Title* unto nothing, only *satisfies* for something; nor doth it deserve any Reward. Howbeit, when in Christ it was the highest Act of Obedience, and performed by so glorious a Person as the Son of God,

---

\* Doctor Owen of *Justificat.* p. 384.

it was truly Meritorious of Acceptance with God, of Grace, and Glory. ' Yet the Redundancy hereof, (as ' Doctor Goodwin somewhere argues) could not excuse Obedience by *Doing*, because not of the same ' kind, as neither the Redundancy of Merit in *Doing* ' could excuse from *Suffering*; for the one answers to ' the Command, the other to the Threatning of the ' Law. \* For, as the Lord Christ could not, by his ' most perfect Obedience, satisfy the Curse of the Law, ' *Dying thou shalt die*; so by the utmost of his *Suffering*, he could not fulfil the Command of the Law, ' *Do this and Live*. The first, and most direct effect therefore, of the Death of Christ, is *Satisfaction* for the Offence past; and from its infinite Worth it is also Meritorious of Salvation: But that it is so of any Law, or Covenant, I no where read in my Bible. Had the Penalties fallen on *Us*, it had been *Suffering* or *Punishment* only; but falling on Christ, it was the highest Obedience also.

Mr. Clark gives this Account of Christ's Righteousness, ' It is his observing the Law, Rule, Command, given unto him by his Father, (*Joh. 10. 18.*) ' it is particularly, His Conformity to the Law of ' Mediation, or his observing the Articles of the ' Covenant of Redemption. I answer, That Christ had received Commandment from the Father, what to speak, and also do, is clear, *Joh. 12. 49. c. 14. 31.* that there was a Covenant between the Father and Him, which you may call the *Covenant of Redemption*, or *Law of Mediation*, I deny not; but when he is said to be made under the Law, and fulfil the Law, *Gal. 4. 4. Mat. 5. 17.* it is the Law of Creation, or Ten Commandments, which we were under. The Texts speak for themselves. Now in Fulfilling this Law, he fulfilled the Law of Mediation, for that re-

---

\* *Ibid.* p. 383.

quir'd him to fulfil the whole Law of God *given to us*. He did it not of *Himself*, and therefore did it as required of the Father; and therefore also did it as not *for Himself*: For it was in Pursuance of that Covenant which concern'd *our Redemption*. This Account of Christ's Righteousness, that it is a *Conformity to the Law of Mediation, &c.* insinuates, that Christ was not under the Law which we are under, or that his Obedience thereto is no part of our Justifying Righteousness. Indeed it is the professed Design; else it might have been said, that it is a *Conformity to the Law of God, given to Adam, and to all Men*. With what Sincerity then is it pretended, that his *Active* Obedience is included in his *Passive*, except the Design be equally to exclude the latter also? On this Notion of *Christ's Obeying the Law of Mediation*, the new Method very much depends. I shall therefore endeavour to prove, that *Jesus Christ obey'd the Precept of the Law for us*: And only answer Mr. *Clark's* Objections, as they lie in my Way, and not follow him Step by Step, which was not the Design of this Undertaking.

1. *Jesus Christ did keep and fulfil the very Law of Creation, the Precept of the Moral Law perfectly, and to the utmost Extent thereof.* I enquire not now after the Reason, or End of it. (1.) *His Nature* was every way conformed to the Law, *Psal. 40. 8. The Law is within my Heart*: than which nothing could be more expressive of perfect *Rectitude of Nature*, and that in *Conformity to the Law*. He was not born in Sin, as others are, *Luke 1. 35.* because, not being naturally in *Adam's Loins*, he was no Head to Christ, who therefore was not concern'd in *Adam's Covenant*, or the Transgression of it. (2.) *His whole Life* was absolutely, and in every Point, regulated by this Law; not only all his Actions and Words, but even his Thoughts also. He did never transgress

the *least* Command, in the *least* thing whatsoever. Did the Law require Love? In him was perfect Love; Sinners find it so. Did it require Innocency? He was Innocent. He fail'd not in any Instance, either by way of Omission, or Commission, 1 *Pet.* 2. 22. *Heb.* 7. 26. These Things will not be deny'd. And that the Law which he was under, was the very *Law of Creation*, the whole *Moral Law*, and that his *Conformity* and *Obedience* thereto was *Idem*; the *very same* (only with Advantage on Christ's Part) which was found with innocent *Adam*, and ought to have been found with all his Posterity, is so clear, that I cannot conceive what should be said against it. For when the *Rule* was the same, and all his *Actions* squared thereby, his *Obedience* must needs be the same. Righteousness and Holiness is the very *Image of God*, and the *End of Law*. It was *lost in Adam*; it is in part *restored* in Believers, *Ephes.* 4. 24. But in its *Perfection* it was *found* in Christ.

2. The Lord Jesus fulfill'd this Righteousness for Others, obey'd the Precept of the Law for the *Elect*. \* It is said by those of the contrary Judgment, That being Man, He was *necessarily* under the Law for *Himself*; and that he was thereby *Qualify'd* to offer up a Sacrifice acceptable to God, and available for us.

I Answer, 1. The Lord Christ was *Born* for us, *Isa.* 9. 6. 'That altho' this Legal Obedience was 'required of Christ by the Right of Creation, when 'he was become Man; yet because he was *made Man*, 'not for *Himself*, but for *us*, it was a part of his 'Humiliation, Satisfaction, and Merit, which God

---

\* I except Mr. Clark, as to this, who excellently proves, That Christ was not bound to Obey the Law for *Himself*. Script. Justific. p. 94.

\* required



\* required and accepted of *him* for us, Amos, Medol, 1. 1. c. 21, and 24.

2. He was *made under the Law* for us. I confess, the meaning of these Words [*for us*] neither in the former Head, nor in this, is the same as [*in our stead*]. But he was neither born, nor made under the Law *for us*, altogether for our Sakes, and for our Salvation, unless it were for that End, that he might do something *in our stead*; that the Law of God, being perfectly fulfill'd, Life and Salvation might be purchased for us, which could not be conferred without a perfect Righteousness. He was born, and made under the Law *for us*, that He might obey, and die *in our stead*.

3. Take some Scripture Testimony. In Gal. 4. 4. We read, *God sent forth his Son, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς ἡσέβουον οὐ το νόμον, made of a Woman, made under the Law.* Here *made under the Law* is reckon'd as a distinct Act, from his being *made of a Woman*. For indeed, the Israelites who were born under the Sinai Covenant, were under the Law, not only as the rest of the World, but the Obligation was strengthened by the giving of the Law by Moses. Now Christ was of *that Race*, and the Law took fast hold of him, as being a Person *Responsible*, and the Man *intended* all along by God, when the Law was given, (as hath been shewn already) or else it had been a proper Covenant of Works to Israel. So that here is a visible being *made under the Law*, even Moses's Law, or the Ten Commandments, which did not result meerly from his being *born of a Woman*. And further, tho' Christ, being made Man, were in some sort under the Law, by the Right of Creation; yet I cannot conceive that he had been under the Law, *in Statu Viatoris*, for *Eternal Life*, for a *Right* or *Title* thereto, or in an *humbled State*, or in any other Sense than Angels or glorify'd Saints are, or his humane Nature.

Nature, the Forty Days after his Resurrection here on Earth was, or now in Heaven is, if it had not been for our sakes, That He being the Son of God, and Heir of all things, had any less Glory, was altogether for our sakes. Nor can I think, that He had lived such a *Series* and Length of Time in Humiliation, Obedience, and Subjection to the Law, and to Men [his Parents] by Virtue of it, if it had not been of *Necessity*, with respect to the great Work of our *Redemption*. When *Herod* slew the Infants, he might have been One, and have taken the nearest Way to Glory. Who can say that he was not *Qualify'd* to have been a Sacrifice?

*Lastly*, This Clause [*made under the Law*] has such a *Weight* and *Emphasis* in it, that it signifies some special Act of God, whereby he was *constituted* and *put* under the Law, in some further Sense than what was meerly *Natural* and *Necessary*. And the End of it is given, *v. 5. That He might redeem them that were under the Law*; He was made under the *Curse* of the Law, and I hope it will not be deny'd, that *that* was in our *stead*: And if he were at all under the *Precept* of the Law for Obedience, then I argue, his *whole* being under the Law, and Obedience to it, as so under it, is altogether referred to this end, [*the Redeeming of them that were under the Law.*] And it is yet the more evident, because his being *made under the Law* commenceth, and taketh Date from his being *made of a Woman*; so that all he did, his whole Life, was, as under the Law, and in Obedience to it, for our *Redemption* from it.

Again, Once more look into *Mat. 5.* where we have a full and expresse Testimony to this Truth, *v. 17, 18. Think not that I am come to destroy the Law;—I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For Christ to fulfil the Law, is the same as to fulfil all Righteousness;*

*Righteousness*; Mat. 3. 15. which was by doing the Father's Will, and belonged to his *bringing in an Everlasting Righteousness for us*, Dan. 9. 24. He speaks of his Fulfilling of it in *his own Person*; and as that which was the *End of his Coming*. Now that which was the *very End of his Coming* was for us, and was referr'd to the *Justification and Salvation of Sinners*, 1 Tim. 1. 15. He gives the Reason of his Coming to fulfil it, Mar. 5. 18. And that is taken from the Stability, Unchangeableness, and Eternal Veracity of the Law: It is so Sacred and Agreeable to the Nature of God himself, that *Heaven and Earth shall sooner pass away*, &c. For God cannot cease to be as Holy in his Nature, and therefore must be as Holy in the Revelation of his Will, as ever. There is not a Jot or Tittle to be abated. Surely the *Ten Commandments* are more than a JOT or TITTLE of the Law, \* and therefore *must* be intended. You'll say, *Who can thus fulfil the Law*, as not to miss of a Jot or Tittle? Christ tells us plainly, *HE came to Fulfil it*, V. 17. O Blessed *Second Adam*! And then when he presently subjoins, Ver. 20. *Except your Righteousness exceed*, &c. is it not plainly to tell us, that He therefore fulfilled the Law, that we might have a Righteousness exceeding that of the *Scribes and Pharisees*; and that He *Obedied for us*? The Necessity lay here, It must be so fulfilled, that *Sinners might be justify'd and saved*. Again, when he tells us, that *He came to fulfil the Law*, &c. and then proceeds from V. 21. to expound the Commandments, and shew their Spirituality; is it not clearly to tell us *what Law* He fulfilled, *even these very Commandments*, which could in no wise pass away, but must be thus exactly Fulfilled; seeing the End of their being given was Obedience?

---

\* Nec Apex nec Jot a quidem subscriptum.

One Scripture more I cannot forbear Quoting, viz. Rom. 5. 19. *As by One Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners, so by the Obedience of One shall many be made Righteous.* In this Context there is a Comparison and Parallel carried on between the Two Adams, as Two Common Heads, and publick Persons. How then were we made Sinners by Adam's Disobedience? I Answer, by the *Guilt of that Act* of eating the forbidden Fruit. How came we Guilty? I Answer, By the Imputation thereof; he standing for all his Seed. Some will say, we are made Sinners only by the *Propagation of a corrupt Nature*, which we receive handed down from our first Parents: And so answerably are made Righteous, by the *Communication of a Holy Nature* from Christ. I Answer, then it might have been said, By *One Man* many were made Sinners, and this Word [Disobedience] might have been spared. But it was not only by *one Man*, but by that very *Disobedience*. He disobeyed and all were Sinners thereby, by that *Act* of his,  $\Delta\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\ \rho\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , by that *One Disobedience*, V. 18. \* For as  
 ' to Corruption of Nature, that comes to be a Sin only as  
 ' it refers to or is connected with the *Guilt* of an *Act*  
 ' of Sin, which caused it. If therefore that Corruption  
 ' become truly and properly a Sin in us, as well as in  
 ' him, He must necessarily be constituted a Publick  
 ' Person; representing us in Respect of that very  
 ' *Act* of Sin. — For it is not the Want of Righteousness simply, which is a Sin, but as relating to  
 ' a Forfeiture and losing of it, which they are first  
 ' guilty of who lose it. In like Manner Jesus Christ stood up as a Publick Person to raise up, redeem, and justify by his own Personal Obedience, that we might be saved by *Another Man's* Obeying for us. For it is not simply, by *one Man* we are made



righteous efficiently, as communicating Holiness; but by One Man's Obedience, His Obedience is the Thing: By this we are said to be made (*κατασθις*) or constituted Righteous. But saith Mr. Clark, This Text is to be interpreted by Phil. 2. 8. *He became obedient unto Death*; this being more Particular, and that in Romans more General. Answer, I take this to be as General as that, and that to be as Particular as this; for when the Apostle speaks to the Romans, of his Obedience, and it is no where limited, it ought to be taken without Limitation, as including his whole Obedience which he performed for us. For as to that Text to the Philipians, if it be limited to his Death strictly; it will exclude all his Sufferings, Agonies, Reproaches, before his Passion on the Cross. But if you include them, by the same Reason you include all his Active Obedience. For the Expression is [*obedient unto Death*,] not only in Death, but thro' his whole Life, unto Death: That same Principle of Love and Obedience, which acted him all his Life, carry'd him forth to the last and highest Act of Obedience, the Offering himself to God.

That Christ's Active Obedience was perform'd for his People, is so well known to be the commonly receiv'd Doctrine of Protestants, that I need not stand to prove it. I shall only mention the Testimony of Two confessedly great Men. The one is \* Dr. Ames, 'Neither ought (says he) any Part of that Obedience which is found in the Humiliation of Christ to be excluded from that Dignity and Use [*viz.* of Satisfaction and Merit.] Again, in Subjection to his Parents, which belongs to the Fifth Commandment, he shewed that he was subject to the whole Moral Law. (1.) Because there is the same Rea-

\* Ames. Medul. l. 1. c. 20. § 14. and c. 21. § 23, 24.

' son of one Commandment, and of all. (2.) Be-  
 ' cause there is no Part of Moral Obedience, which  
 ' might seem more Forreign from Christ the Lord  
 ' of Heaven and Earth, than Subjection to Men.  
 The other is \* Mr. *Clarkson*. ' I apprehend it (saith  
 ' he) to be a Truth of some Moment, to the Honour  
 ' of Christ and Comfort of Believers, and this dis-  
 ' cover'd in the Gospel, and asserted by the Commu-  
 ' nity of Protestant Divines, from whom I would  
 ' not be tempted to straggle, and wish others would  
 ' not, upon slender Ground, especially in our pre-  
 ' sent Circumstances, wherein *Papists* make so great  
 ' an Advantage of Stragglers, and make it the Mat-  
 ' ter of no little Triumph, when they see any Part  
 ' of the Common Protestant Doctrine deserted by its  
 ' Professors. Where he proceeds with great Evi-  
 ' dence to shew that Christ performed perfect Obe-  
 ' dience for us, even in our stead; and answers the  
 ' Objections made against the Doctrine of Christ's  
 ' Active Obedience Fulfilled for us. To which I refer  
 ' the Reader. In Defence of this Doctrine, See also  
 ' Dr. *Owen* of *Justification*, Ch. 12. throughout; which  
 ' I think is unanswerable.

I would next remove some *Objections*, and con-  
 ' clude this Head. It is objected, *If Christ suffer'd*  
*and satisfy'd for Sin, there was no Need he should O-*  
*bey the Precept of the Law for us.* For if our Sins  
 of *Commission* are Pardon'd by his Death and Blood-  
 shed, our Sins of *Omissions*, or Want of Obedience  
 are also pardon'd thereby. But if our *Omissions* and  
*Failures* in Obedience be Pardon'd together with the  
 other, thro' his *Death*, then we are reckon'd to have  
 done all which the Law requires, and need no other  
 Righteousness. Hence they conclude there is no  
 Need for Christ's *Obedying actively* for us, because all

\* *Clarkson's Sermons*, p. 235. Ed. Printed 1696.

our Comings short are *Pardon'd thro' His Blood.*

I *Answer*, It follows not. In every Sin of Omission are Two Parts. (1.) Positive Offence, by a Contempt of the Authority of the Law-giver. (2.) Want of Actual Righteousness, which was to arise out of Obedience. The *Death* of Christ makes *Satisfaction* for the Offence that it may be pardon'd: His *Active Obedience* exhibits that Actual Righteousness. Sins of Omission (I confess) do require *Satisfaction*, as well as Sins of Commission, seeing they do as truly offend *in excessu*, tho' their whole Nature may seem to lie *in defectu*, in the Want of something which we ought to have. Yet, we are not found *Doers*, or *actually righteous*, by the bare Pardon of Sins of Omission. *Suffering* for Offences of any Kind, is not of the same Nature with *doing* of what is required. And tho' a Man suffers for a Fault of Omission, yet it had been more Acceptable to have done his Duty. And tho' *Satisfaction* be given, and receiv'd for the *Offence*, yet he is not counted worthy of a *Reward* which had been due upon Obedience. So that tho' the Offence be Pardon'd, yet still an Actual Righteousness is wanting, which was to arise from Obedience. Howbeit, if I could give no other Answer, I would say, It belongs to that *Abundance of Grace and the Gift of Righteousness*, whereof the Apostle speaks, *Rom. 5. 17.* And that there might be such a *plentiful Abundance*, and that the Law might *clearly and distinctly* be honoured both in its Precept and Penalty, Christ *Obey'd* the former, as well as *suffer'd* the latter.

A main Argument pressed earnestly by Mr. *Clark*, in the Book before-mentioned, P. 106. is that Christ's *Active Obedience* can be referr'd to none of all the *Offices* of Jesus Christ, neither to his *Prophetical*, *Priestly*, or *Kingly Office*; and therefore was not at all performed by him for us.

I confess Dr. *Ames Med. J. 1. c. 19. § 11.* gives excellent Reasons why this Number and Order of his Offices is assigned; from which I would not, neither need to depart. Yet the assigning, and so confining of them, is an *Human* Thing; at least it would appear so to be, if Scripture Ground and Reason should lead to assign some Fourth; suppose his *Headship*; (*Ephes. 1. 22.*) Of which Dr. *Goodwin* on *Ephes. Serm. 36.* almost thought that he must have made another Office. There had been no Heresy in it if it had. 'I have often had many 'Discussions with my self (says he) whether this Relation of *Headship*, should not import some distinct 'Office from those of *King, Priest* and *Prophet*, to 'which *Three*, all Divines, do reduce the Offices of 'Christ; but I have at last resolv'd my Thoughts 'thus, That this Relation of *Headship* doth import all 'his Offices; but with that Peculiarness, and with 'that Eminency, as no other Relation in Scripture 'doth. For we are Ruled by Christ, not only as a 'King, by Laws, Externally, but by him internally, as the Members by the Head, &c. So I say, seeing I find Christ's *Active Obedience* in Scripture, it should make no Hesitation with me, could I refer it to none of his Offices. This Argument therefore is without a Foundation, tho' he builds much upon it. But I depart not from the received Distribution of Christ's Offices. His *Active Obedience* then belongs to his *Priestly* Office. Whatsoever he did as *Surety*, doth so, *Heb. 7. 22.* But this he did as *Surety*, which I shall by and by endeavour to shew.

As to what this Author saith, Pag. 107. 'That 'Christ's Righteousness belongs equally to Him, in 'Respect of all his Offices, and that it no more belongs to Christ to fulfil all Righteousness for us, 'as Priest, than as Prophet or King; It is to me altogether surprizing, and certainly is a great Mistake, tend-



tending to exclude Christ's *Sufferings*, (which beyond Controversy were undergone by him as a Priest) from having any more Part in justifying Sinners, than what he did as Prophet or King; which I think would gratify a *Socinian* well. But if his Righteousness as *Priest* (and that only) be a justifying Righteousness, then (perhaps) Mr. *Clark* was aware that his Active Obedience, being confessedly of one entire Piece with his Passive might be included under his Priestly Office.

He further objecteth, *There was no such Thing Typified by any Thing which the Priests did under the Law.* I Answer, There must have been a Man come down from Heaven, in the Manner that Christ did, if Any had been a Perfect Type of Him in all Things. And tho' it did not belong to the Priests under the Law to obey for the People, because of the Imperfection of their Priesthood; yet it might belong to Jesus Christ, who is a *Surety of a better Testament*: And it must be own'd the Priests were very imperfect Types of Christ's Suretiship. And why might not *Melchisedeck* be a Type of Christ herein? He is said to be first *King of Righteousness*, then *King of Peace*, and *Priest of the most High God*, Heb. 7. Doubtless his *Righteousness* and *Peace* whereof he is said to be *King*, were a part of the Glory of his Priesthood; for that is the great Thing, with Respect to which the *Apostle* brings him in. And as these are fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ, Righteousness and Peace do not only belong to his *Kingly Office*, but especially to his *Priestly Office*; and *Peace* comes in by *Righteousness*. Now He is said to be *King* of them because there is a *Royal Dignity, Sovereignty and Glory* shed on his Priesthood. *Grace reigneth thro' Righteousness*, Rom. 5. 21. *Grace* hath erected a Kingdom. So Righteousness and Peace reign by Jesus Christ. His Kingdom is a Kingdom wherein that glorious

Righteousness and Peace of his Priesthood, are display'd and glorify'd. So that the Glory of his Kingdom is, that the Righteousness and Peace of his Priesthood have the chief Rule, and bear sway therein, *Zech. 6. 13.* In which Manner, *Jer. 23. 5, 6.* may be interpreted to the abundant Consolation of Believers.

And what were the High Priest's Garments, wherein he ministred to the Lord? What was the meaning of this rich and costly Apparel, this glorious Attire? With the Names of the Children of *Israel* born before God, and *Holiness to Jehovah*, written upon the Plate of his holy Crown fasten'd on the Mitre? It was to signify as far as could be Typed out, the Holiness of the Nature, and Life of our great High Priest, who appear'd in the Discharge of his Priestly Office, and now appears in the holy Place as perfect *Holiness to Jehovah*; and that for his Children, bearing their Names upon his Breast-plate (as it were) and upon his Shoulders. Lastly, What was the Meaning of the Law, even the Ten Commandments being put into the Ark, and there preserved; but to signify its being kept and fulfill'd in *Jesus Christ*?

But, saith Mr. *Clark*, *There is nothing of it* [Christ's Active Obedience] *in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the Apostle treats largely on the Priesthood of Christ.* I answer, If it be in other Scriptures it is sufficient. But I think he is mistaken. I have already spoken of *Melchisedec*. And in the same Epistle we read, *Tho' he were a Son, yet learned he Obedience by the things he suffer'd, Heb. 5. 8.* Obedience there is distinguished from his Sufferings. I grant it is not expressly said here, that it was in *our stead*; yet is there mention made thereof, even when he is speaking of his Priesthood. And being made perfect, *V. 9. viz. thro' Sufferings, (Heb. 2. 10.)* for that was the last and finishing Stroke of his Obedience wherein all terminated and was perfected. *He became the Author*  
of

of *Eternal Salvation*, viz. By his *entire* and *whole* *Obedience*, and *Sufferings* before mentioned. And again, *Such an High-Priest became us who is holy, harmless, &c.* Ch. 7. 26. There was no Necessity the High-Priests under the Law should be such; but the true and great High-Priest must excell them. Nor doth he say, [*Such it became Him to be*] as pointing out only a Qualification for Sacrificing Work: But [*It became us*] it was necessary for *us*, on *our* Account. I take it, that the Purity and Holiness of Christ, both in *Nature* and *Life*, are intended in this last mentioned Text, as belonging to Christ in his *Priestly* Office. It is strange that Men are so sore afraid of too much *Grace*, of too much Consolation in Christ Jesus!

Our Author hath yet another Argument, viz. 'What Christ did or suffer'd in our stead, we need not do or suffer: But we are still bound to obey the Law, therefore he did not obey in our stead. He addeth, 'Because he underwent the Curse and Penalty of the Law, therefore we need not undergo it, but are excused from it: And if we need not suffer, because Christ hath suffer'd in our stead; no more need we to obey, because Christ hath obey'd in our stead. Here he subjoins *that* which is ordinarily the *Answer* hereto: And it is a good Answer, viz. That as, tho' Christ dy'd in our stead, yet we must die: So, tho' he obey'd in our stead, yet we must obey; but not for the same Ends and Purposes as he did. As we don't *suffer* to satisfy Divine Justice, so neither do we *obey* to merit Life and Salvation thereby. Now Mr. Clark's Reply to this, (for ought I see) don't at all weaken it. For whereas he saith, 'By Christ's Death true Believers are absolutely freed from suffering any part of the Penalty of the Law; that their Death is quite of another Nature than Christ's

‘ Christ’s Death; that tho’ Christ’s Death be of the  
 ‘ same Nature in a Physical Sense, both consisting  
 ‘ in a Separation of Soul and Body, yet in a Moral  
 ‘ Sense they are of as different Natures as may be.  
 Is not all this said and supposed in the Answer which  
 he replies to? And is it not hence inferred, that  
 therefore our Obedience may have Place, *for a quite*  
*different End*, altho’ Christ has obey’d? Howbeit,  
 he hence concludes, that the Argument still holds  
 good, in regard of *Suffering*, that because Christ  
 suffer’d we need not suffer. I deny it, if he speak of  
 Suffering and Death *absolutely and materially*: But if  
 he mean otherwise, (as indeed he doth) that we need  
 not suffer *the Curse*, he has return’d just no Answer  
 at all; but has only said Believers need not die un-  
 der the Penalty of the Law, neither do so: And  
 therefore clearly his Consequence is not good, that  
 we need not obey *for some other End*, if Jesus Christ  
 obeyed for us.

Christ’s Obedience respected the Law as a *Cove-*  
*nant: Ours*, as a *Directory or Rule*. His Obedience  
 was to obtain a Title to Eternal Life; *Ours* is for  
 other Ends. Our Obedience ought to be *materially*  
 the same as his, but not aimed at that *End*. I only  
 say [it ought to be,] for I dare say, notwithstanding  
 our best Obedience, there is need enough that  
 Christ should have obey’d the Law fully. And  
 there is no Danger here of the same Debt being paid  
*twice*; as it would be in part, if Believers sufferd  
*Penalty*. Neither our *Obedience*, nor our *Sufferings*,  
 are necessary to satisfy Divine Justice, to justify our  
 Persons, and obtain a Title to Life. *The One* ap-  
 pears in the Salvation of Elect dying Infants, and  
 such as the Thief upon the Cross; for whom Christ  
 must needs have *obey’d*. *The Other*, in the Transla-  
 tion of *Enoch* and *Elijah*; for whom Christ must  
 needs have *Dy’d*. Justice could admit all to go  
 that



that Way (else it could have admitted none) if it were the Pleasure of God. Hence it is we are not under the Law, as Christ was for us, to obey it *to that End*. For *he is the End of the Law, [for Righteousness.]* As to that Matter of working out a justifying Righteousness, he is altogether the End of it.

II. *Jesus Christ suffer'd the Penalty of the Law, the Curse and Threatning thereof, for us, even the same which was our Due.*

The *Suffering* of Christ for us is owned by all professing Christianity: His suffering *in our stead*, is owned by all except Socinians; save that some who would not be so accounted, have of late been mincing the Matter, and disguising upon this Expression, till they scarce know what themselves mean by it. He dy'd [so] in our stead (say they) as to secure the Honour of God in his Law, that he can go upon lower Terms with us, and accept of a Gospel-Obedience of our own, for a justifying Righteousness. If the Death of Christ was only a Compliance with the *Law of Mediation*, and not the very Curse of the *same Law* that we had broken, whatever the *Effect* of it may be to us ward, or however, in some *improper Sense*, it may be interpreted to have been in our stead; yet in a *proper and strict Sense* it cannot be so. An *Exchange* it is not, however it may be thought to be *meritorious* on our Behalf, at least conditionally, upon our Obedience, &c. Christ died in our *stead*, that is (say some) *that we might not die*. The Meaning of which, in plain Terms, is, *that we might live*; but how? By our own Obedience, and fulfilling a Gospel-Righteousness. But this is not dying in our *stead properly*; that Law and Justice should rest *satisfy'd* in his glorious Performances.

The Sacrifices of Old were offer'd in the Room of the Offender; whose *laying his Hand* thereon,  
(Lev.

(*Lev. 1. 4. and 3. 2.*) signify'd the transferring of his Sin and Guilt unto his Victim. As if he should say, I freely own I have deserved to die, for such and such Sins; But, Lord, by thine Appointment, I bring here a Sacrifice, a poor Beast to die for me. Accept it in my stead. 'Tis true, these Sacrifices could not do away Sin, (*Heb. 10. 1.*) but were referred in their whole Typical Nature and Use to Christ's Sacrifice, thro' which there is a Real and Eternal Forgiveness, whereof that Political Forgiveness, which was by those Sacrifices, was only a Type.

Again, this Word [for] *ἀντὶ, ὑπὲρ* with Respect to Christ's Death runs thro' the New Testament. *To give his Life a Ransom FOR many. FOR the unjust. FOR the Sheep;* and the like.\* Whereby nothing less is meant than his dying in our very room and stead. For, he was under the Sentence of Death and Obligation to die by the Law, either on his own Account, or on *ours*: For there is no Obligation to Death, but on Account of some Breach of the Law, and by Virtue of the Penal Sanction thereof. But it is clear, He that never *offended*, could not be *cut off for himself*, *Dan. 9. 26.* Therefore it must be, by coming into *our* Place, under our Law-Obligation to Death, in our stead and Place, *2 Cor. 5. 21.*

III *Jesus Christ fulfill'd the Precept, and suffer'd the Penalty of the Law as our SURETY.* If it be own'd that he obey'd, and dy'd, properly in *our* stead, there will be no great need to dispute this Point. For, that he obey'd and suffer'd in *our* stead, must needs be founded in the Relation of Suretyship. And let Men take heed how they distinguish here.

---

\* *Mat. 20. 28. 1 Pet. 3. 18. John 10. 15. Ch. 11. 50, 51, 52. Ch. 18. 14.*

lest they lose all the Ground and Footing that themselves and others stand upon for Salvation. It is a Doctrine so Fundamental, so sweet and comfortable, that it seems strange to me, that any who know the *Terrour of the Lord*, and are truly concern'd about the *Glory of Christ*, and their own *Salvation*, should once open their Mouths to Eclipse the *Glory of it*. I confess that Jesus Christ is but once called a *Surety* in the Scripture, *Heb. 7. 22.* but that is sufficient to warrant the Use of that Word; especially when the Thing intended by it, is held forth in the whole Scripture.

1. It is *Objected* here, That he is called the *Surety of a better Testament*; whereas it should seem, if it were the Covenant of *Works* he were to fulfil and satisfy for the Breach of, in our stead, he had been a *Surety of that Covenant*, not of the *better Testament*. I answer, that this *better Testament*, as here considered by the Apostle, is opposed to the *First Testament*, *viz.* that Covenant, or Testament, made with *Israel at Sinai*, as is declared, *Heb. 8.* And more especially it is the *Levitical and Ceremonial Part* of that Covenant, which he hath a Respect unto in this Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Now then, there is a Comparison between the *Priests* after the Order of *Aaron*, and *Jesus Christ*: And the Preference in these Words (as indeed in the whole Comparison) is given to Christ, *Heb. 7.* throughout. It is clearly insinuated here, that the *High-Priest* under the Law (as a Type of Christ) was a *Surety of that Testament*. *Suretyship* then belonged to the *Priesthood*; and it belongs to *Christ's Priesthood*, which is a Consideration as great and glorious, as it is sweet and comfortable. So that in the whole Execution of his *Priestly Office*, he was a *Surety* for us, and did it as a *Surety*: And when he was the *Surety of the Law Covenant*, he was

not the *Procurer* of that Covenant, but a Priest *ministering* to God, not in the way of the Old Testament, which was dedicated by the *Blood of others*, Heb. 9. 18.—23. but establishing and ratifying a New Testament, by *his own* most Precious Blood. For the way of those Priests, and that Testament, was to offer the Blood of Bulls and Goats; but the way of this Priest, Surety, and Testament, is to offer unto God, the Blood of his own Dear Son. He is indeed the Surety of the New Testament, *to procure and purchase all the Benefits of it*; but that must be by *obeying and suffering in our stead*. So that still he was a Surety for us God-ward, Heb. 5. 1. and that with Respect to the Blessings of the New Covenant, for the Procurement of them; which was done by his great and glorious Obedience, in the Discharge of his Priestly Office.

2. It is said, *Christ is a Surety indeed, but not according to the common Notion of it among Men, not a Money-Surety*. That is, (as I understand it) not by way of Exchange, to lay down the *same Price*, which was from us due; but to lay down a Price, that might secure the Honour and Glory of God, as Law-giver, so far, that he might enter upon New Terms with us, and accept of a Gospel-Obedience at our Hand, instead of a perfect Law-Righteousness.

*Answer.* (1.) Thus Christ would be a Surety no otherwise than a Man is so, who by paying some part of the Price, procures an exasperated Creditor to accept of a Composition. (2.) Thus he is made a *Procurer of the New Covenant it self*, which is at once inconsistent with his being the Surety of it, and is no where affirmed in the whole Book of God. Now it is strange, if this were Christ's principal Work, to purchase a New Covenant, that it should be no where ascribed to him. But the making a New Covenant is ascribed to the Grace and Will of God,



God, as the only Cause, *Heb. 8. 8.* And those things which are required in a way of Duty on our part; as Faith, Repentance, &c. tho' these things themselves, as Blessings given and communicated, are Effects of the Death of Christ, yet as prescribed as matter of Duty to us, they are not the Effect of his Death, *Vid. Dr. Owen on Heb. 7. 22. p. 223, 224.* (3.) Whereas the Stress of the Objection lies very much against his paying the very same Obedience, and bearing the same Punishment required at our Hand. I have already spoken to the former; and as to his *Sufferings* and *Death*, it was surely the same with the Threatning and Curse due to us. It is true, *Spiritual Death*, in Depravation of Nature, Blindness of Mind, and Hardness of Heart, could not possibly touch our Lord Jesus, nor can it be supposed so to do without Blasphemy; for this would have destroyed his whole Undertaking: Christ was a Sinner only by *Imputation*, and that not of *Necessity*, by *Adam's Covenant*, (which is the way that Depravation of Nature comes on us) wherein Christ was not concern'd, but by *Voluntary Susception*. Again, *Spiritual Death* was not any part of Punishment, by way of *Suffering and Pain*; and therefore not required to make Satisfaction. Nor has it *firstly* and *solely* the Nature of Punishment, as if it took its Rise only from the *Threatning* of the Law; but it has *firstly* the Nature of *Sin*, and Contrariety to the Precept of the Law, being a *natural necessary* Effect of the first Breach thereof; and when it has the Nature of *Punishment*, this is a *Secondary* Thing, and superadded by God's Constitution to its Original Nature. I therefore contend, that Christ bore the same, the *Idem* of the Curse, only as to that *Penal Evil*, which has a Relation only to the *Threatning* of the Law, as a *Curse*, and not also to the *Precept* thereof, as a *Sin*; and which

which (on that Account) can alone be *Satisfactory*. He bore the *same Curse* which was due to us, *viz.* *Death* and the *Wrath* of God, which is the whole of *Painful Punishment*.

I would be understood, of the *Essence* and *Substance* of the Curse. For,

1. It was not necessary that Christ should *descend to the Place of the damned*; for this is but a *Circumstance*. I think it may truly be said (tho' I deny not a *Local Hell*) that the *Fallen Angels* carry their *Hell* about with them; and also, that Christ sustain'd the *Pains of Hell*: In which Sense *Calvin* (*Institut.* 1. 2. c. 16. § 8, and 10.) understands that Article of the Creed, [*He descended into Hell*] and not of the *Grave*; for then why is it distinguished from being [*Buried?*] — 'It was necessary (saith he) that Christ should feel the *Severity* of *Divine Vengeance*; whereby he might both undergo God's *Anger*, and satisfy his *Righteous Judgment*; from whence also it behoved him to conflict (as it were) *Hand to Hand*, with the *Hosts of Hell*, and with the *Horrors of Eternal Death* — Therefore he is said to have descended to *Hell*, when he suffer'd that *Death* which is inflicted on the *Wicked* by an *angry God*. It sufficeth therefore that Christ suffer'd both the *Punishment of Pain*, and also of *Loss*. The former is evident. And as to the latter, it is clear Christ sustain'd the *Hidings* of the *Father's Face* from him: As to sensible *Enjoyments*, and *Communion*, he was as one *cast off*. Who can express the *Darkness* his blessed Soul was in, both in his *Agony* and on the *Cross*?

2. It was not necessary that *Despair* should take hold of him. Tho' this is a part of the *Misery* of the *Damned*, and of the *Second Death*, yet it is not (I conceive) *Essential* to the *Curse*, but *Accidental*, arising from the *Knowledge* and *Sense* of utter *Inability* ever to make *Attonement* and *Satisfaction*. In

Hell

Hell (tho' it would still be truly Hell) were there any Hope of ever making satisfaction, thro' continuance of Sufferings, that Blackness of Horror and Despair would cease. Now Jesus Christ knew very well; that he should obtain a glorious *Victory*, make a full satisfaction, and overcome Death in the Conflict.

3. It was not necessary that Christ's Sufferings should be *Eternal*. An able responsible Person may pay the *same* Sum, in few Hours, that another is not able to pay his whole Life Time. The Sufferings of the Damned, even to Eternity, can never make satisfaction. They are to all Eternity, paying the Debt; but Jesus Christ being the *Son of God*, having Infinite Power, was able to do it at once. For do but consider the Infinite Worth and Dignity of the Person, who did, and suffer'd all this for us. It was no other than *God incarnate, God in the Flesh*. *Be astonished, O ye Heavens, at this!* How great must be the Value of every Act of Obedience? How unutterable is the Worth of his Humiliation, Sorrows, Sufferings and Death, tho' fulfill'd in so short a space of Time? For when every Act of Obedience is multiplied by innumerable Millions of Millions, and finite Sufferings multiply'd by Infinite, who can cast up the Sum total, and tell us what the Product is?

Nay, But then you'll say, *We are upon the Rocks on the other hand, for that which is over and above, in worth and value, is not the same, but something different, something more excellent.* But stop a little, and consider, that the Super-Excellency and Worth ariseth not from hence, that it was some other thing, which was paid down to Divine Justice, than what was from us due; but from the Super-excellent Glory and Dignity of the *Person* paying the same: For *from him*, it amounts to infinitely more than had it been from *us* it could have done. As for Example, an Act of Love to God, or his Neighbour, in Obedience to the Law, tho' materially the same; yet

as from him, it had a Lustre and Brightness upon it, which the Obedience even of Angels hath not.

There is a certain *Infiniteness* in Sin, (*Quoad Objectum*) because it is against an *Infinite* God, which therefore brings a Punishment of *Infinite Duration*, because it cannot be satisfied for by *finite* Creatures: But now comes an *Infinite* Person, Jesus Christ, whose Dignity sheds an *Infinite* worth upon his *Temporal* Sufferings; and fully recompenceth for that *Infinite Duration* of Misery that we were to have undergone. So that here are the *Temporal* Sufferings of an *Infinite* Person, for the *Eternal* Sufferings of *Finite* Creatures. The Sufferings of Christ then, as to the *Matter* and *Substance* of the Punishment and Curse, were the *Idem*, the same which we were to have born; that is, He bore and endured the same for a *Time*, which we were to have endured *Eternally*. For there is nothing worse or more dreadful in Hell, than the Wrath of God poured into the Soul. The Sufferings of Christ's Soul were unspeakable. The Wrath of God due unto us fell upon him. And as to the *Matter* of *Duration*, here is *Tandundem*, an *Equivalent*, and somewhat more prevalent in satisfying.

If it be urged that *Eternity* was in the Threatning, [*Thou shalt die, i. e. Eternal Death,*] and therefore is of the *Essence* of the Punishment due. I am not greatly solicitous hereabout. For if it be so, it is therefore so, because of the *Weakness* of *Finite* Creatures, whose undergoing *Temporal* Death could not satisfy for Sin: But this is fully answer'd in Christ, whose *Temporal* Sufferings are therefore satisfactory, because he was the Son of God.

The whole World were under the Curse: For it is written, *Cursed is every one, &c.* Gal. 3. 10, 13. But Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us. He was made the same Curse, which we were under, and are Redeemed from.

He



He wrought with his Hands, *Mark* 6. 3: wore a Crown of Thorns; was hanged on a Tree; all the Fruits of the Curse, and visible Tokens of his bearing it, *Gen.* 3. 18, 19. *Deut.* 21. 23. The Sum is, Christ was under the *same Law* that we are under and died under the very Curse thereof (and not only under the Law of Mediation, exclusive of the Law we had broken) he sustain'd the *very Wrath of God* which was our due, *Mat.* 26. 37-44. *C.* 27. 46. *Luk.* 22. 44. Thus much I shall, (thro' the Grace of God) and no more (in this matter) am I concern'd to contend for.

It is therefore truly said Christ died our Death, gave his \* Soul for our Souls, his Body for our Bodys. So great † (saith another Author) is the Severity of Divine Justice, as there can be no Reconciliation, unless Justice be satisfied by suffering of the *whole Punishment* that was due— And so great is the Loving-kindness of the Son towards us, that he grudged not for our sakes, to bring upon himself this infinite Load of Wrath, which our Frailty had never been able to sustain. He also excellently discourseth that Christ, with all his Works and Benefits, is wholly ours, that all he did was done entirely for our sake, &c. Another later || Author, and a very great Man, I find speaking thus. The Satisfaction of Christ doth admirably accord with the Majesty of the Divine Government, when the Design was to receive the most heinous Offenders into the greatest Nearness, and Familiarity with God. A Regression became not the Majesty of Heaven; God's Original Constitution that connected *Sin* and the *Curse*, was just. He abides by it, reverseth it not: To have re-

\* *Clementis Rom. Epist. ad Corinth.* S. 49.

† Fox in the Book before quoted, p. 46, 57.

|| Mr. Howe, second part of his *Living Temple*.

versed it was not to have judged the Offenders, but himself. I conceive, a like Argument may be urged touching Christ's *Active Obedience*. God's Original Constitution, that connected the Precept and promised Reward, was just: He abides by it, reverses it not: To have reversed it were to judge himself, to gratifie the Sinner.\*

## C H A P. V.

*Proving, That the Righteousness fulfilled by Jesus Christ, in his own Person, in Obedience and Suffering, is that justifying Righteousness, which is equally imputed to all Believers.*

**T** Here are *Three Points* that I would speak unto here, in so many Propositions. 1. That *this very Righteousness* of Christ, whereof we have been treating, is a Believer's justifying Righteousness before God. 2. That this Righteousness is *Imputed* to all Believers, it is *unto, and upon* them. 3. It is upon them *without Difference*; so that there are no Degrees of Justification.

1. That *this very Righteousness of Christ, (Ipsissima Christi Justitia)* usually called his *Active and Passive Obedience*, is a Believer's justifying Righteousness before God. I have already proved, that the Law must be perfectly obey'd; that Jesus Christ did so obey it, and that as a Surety in the stead of those for whom he undertook: Hence it follows by irresistible Con-

---

\* Of Christ's suffering the *Idem*, see Dr. Owen on the Heb. V. l. 2. Exercit. V. p. 80. And his *Treatise of the Death of Christ*. 4 o. 1650.

sequence,

sequence, that this Righteousness is made over to those he dy'd for, unto Justification, unless he can lose the End of his whole Obedience and die in vain. But I must further confirm this Truth.

It is disputed, whether the Righteousness of Christ be only the *meritorious* Cause of our Justification, or whether also it be the *Matter* of it? That is, to speak plain, whether Christ has merited that our own Obedience should justify us, or whether his *very Obedience* is made over to Believers, to be their Righteousness in which they stand before God? This is the Point, and it is of no small Consequence, both as to the Glory of Christ, and the Souls of Men. I heartily subscribe to this Truth, that Christ's Righteousness is the Meritorious Cause of our Justification. But this is not enough. The *Council of Trent* (*Sess. 6. Cap. 16. Can. 10.*) has decreed, ' If any Man shall say, that Men are justified without the Righteousness of Christ, by which he hath merited it for us, let him be Accursed: And also if a Man shall say, we are formally Righteous by that very Righteousness. Thus a Popish Council has own'd the one, and deny'd the other. But we say Christ's Righteousness is *that* which justifies, *THAT* which commends to God, as a Believer's own Righteousness. If this be deny'd, it leaves room for Man's Righteousness and Works to come in, as much as a *Papist*, or *Arminian* need to desire. Still our Justification may be, nay, must be, by an *Inherent* Righteousness, by Gospel Works, (as they call them) which are of late asserted not to be derogatory to Grace. altho' they be respected as a justifying Righteousness. Christ merited, that we might merit (say the *Papists*) Christ merited, that our Gospel Righteousness might justify us (say others.) And surely this is the highest Effect that can be ascribed

to it, to justify us before God ; \* And it is to make Christ's Righteousness subordinate to ours. They call ours indeed the subordinate. And why so ? Doth not the *Material*, being an Internal Cause, come as near, nay nearer the Effect than an External *meritorious* Cause ? So that this is Yoking *Christ* and *Moses* together, halting between Grace and Works, Another's Righteousness and our own.

It is Christ's Righteousness it self therefore : [*In that alone let me stand, O Lord, at thy Judgment Seat, before thy dreadful Tribunal !* ] And hence it's call'd, the *Righteousness of God*, Rom. 1. 17. which being a general Text, I may (according to Mr. Clark's Rule) explain by one more Particular, viz. 2 Pet. 1. 1. *The Righteousness of God, and our Saviour, Jesus Christ*. This Text explains all those New Testament Texts that speak of the Righteousness of God ; it is Christ's Righteousness, who is God and our Saviour. And why the Righteousness of God ? Rom. 1. 17. Because the Righteousness of *Men* is insufficient. And why a Righteousness *Reveal'd*, but because it was *Another's* ? For our own is known by Nature, and is never said to be Reveal'd. But this Heavenly Righteousness is altogether above Sense and Reason ; and therefore if it is not *Reveal'd*, Men are always disputing against it. And why Reveal'd to Faith, from one Degree of it to another ? Even because Faith it self, *to credere*, or any Work whatsoever, is not *that* which justifies ; nor can any thing else take it in, and close with it.

Again, It is called the *Righteousness of One Man*, Rom. 5. 18. Not of many, but of *One*. And also a Righteousness *brought in*, Dan. 9. 24. Which therefore was not in the World before. But as the *First*

---

\* In the Judgment of Dr. Owen, of Justification. c. 10. p. 332.



*Adam* brought in Sin, so the *Second Adam*, Righteousness; to which I think this Phrase hath Respect. It is a Righteousness brought in for others. For the Prophet is speaking of the Work of Redemption to be fulfilled by Christ; and He was to do these two Things, (1.) With Respect to Sin: To finish, make an End of, and make Reconciliation for Iniquity. (2.) To bring in an Everlasting Righteousness, for the Justification of poor Sinners. Again, it is a Righteousness Imputed, Rom. 4 6. And lastly, a Righteousness which is unto all and upon all that believe, Rom. 3. 22. Surely, these Texts import no less than that it is the Righteousness of the Lord Christ himself, which God hath provided for the Justification of his Elect.

It is objected, If we are justify'd by Christ's keeping and satisfying the Law, then are we justify'd by the Law, and the Works or Deeds thereof, contrary to the Apostle, Rom. 3. 20.

*Answer.* If they own Christ, as the Meritorious Cause of Justification, and if there were any Satisfaction to the Law in what He did or suffer'd, still it follows, so far as we are justify'd by his Righteousness as perform'd to the Law, we are justify'd by the Law, in the Sense of this Objection. But in whatsoever Sense the Apostle excludes the Law, and the Works thereof, he doth wholly and fully exclude it. Again, they themselves who object this, say that Christ is our *Legal* Righteousness; but \* take away with the one Hand what they give with the other. And They also are for Justification by works of a Law, that is the new Law, which Fallacy the Apostle never thought of, but intended to exclude all Works whatsoever as belonging to the Old Law: For he opposeth *Working* to *Believing*. *Working* would be a Righteous-

---

\* Tullij Paulin. Justific. p. 117.

ness of a Man's own performing; but *Believing* is on *Another*. To him that *worketh*, &c. Rom. 4. 4. he don't say, in Obedience to the *Old Law*, but that works at all for Justification. For *Abraham*, whose Works are excluded, was a Believer. So Rom. 11. 6. *And if by Grace: then it is no more of Works*, of any Works: \* They are so directly opposite in this Matter, that they can't stand together. So that clearly he excludes the Deeds of the Law from any Interest at all in our Justification, even all our own *Personal Obedience*. To seek Righteousness in *Another*, a Perfect Obedience of Christ's performing, is quite another Thing. But these Things cannot be understood, unless by the Teaching of God's Spirit.

Nor do I fear to say, that the Righteousness whereby Believers are Justify'd is the most exact *Legal* Righteousness in Heaven or Earth, as perform'd by Christ. But it is not *His* Righteousness or Obedience to the Law, which the Apostle intends to exclude; God forbid; but our *own*. For certain it is, the *Law* revealeth no other Righteousness than that which is *our own*; nor doth a Natural Man know of any other. But a Righteousness of Christ's performing, tho' in Obedience to the Law, is Reveal'd only in the Gospel, Rom. 16, 17. A Righteousness answering the Law, made ready to our Hand, is the highest and most glorious Gospel-Discovery, and is therefore (in the Sense of the Apostle) not a Justification by the Law, or Deeds thereof.

A Second Objection is this, *If the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed, and that wherein we stand before God, then are we as Righteous as Christ is Righteous.* Answer. And what then? Supposing this to be so, where is the Hurt? Must we let go a Truth

---

\* This Text Dr. Tulley calls *Mallens apertum iustitia*. Paulin. iustif. p. 122.

So well establish'd in Scripture, because of a pretended or real Absurdity urged against it? If it be a Real one, it cannot follow from any Scripture-Truth, if it be only pretended, we need not be concern'd at it; Let them that choose it, thrust away Christ's Righteousness from them, for Fear they should be as Righteous as He, I dare not do it. Take then the Righteousness of Christ, as performed *to the Law, in the Human Nature as our Surety*; and I see no Danger to say that Believers who have that Righteousness upon them are as Righteous as He *in the Eye of the Law*. \* Is he clear from all Condemnation by the Law? Is He compleat and perfectly Righteous according to the Commands thereof? So are they in Him, Col. 2. 10. Nor are such Expressions altogether unknown in Scripture. *He that doth Righteousness, is Righteous, even as He is Righteous*, 1 John. 3. 7. And, *Because as He is, so are we in this World*, Chap. 4. 17. Which Places, I think I could shew, have some Respect to Justification. And if they be true in any other Sense, they are more so in that. Joh. 17. 23, 26. *And hast loved them, as thou hast loved me*. Is not Christ eminently the Father's Beloved? Yet there is a Sense wherein *He hath loved them, as He hath loved him*, Joh. 17. 23. that as He is accepted, so are they accepted, and that in Him: for it ariseth from their Union mentioned in the same Verse.

But that there may be no Derogation from Christ, He hath the Preference. (1.) In that there was an *Infinite Worth and Value* derived from his God-head, to all the Acts of his Obedience. This is set to Christ's Account. We are not infinitely Righteous when that Righteousness is made ours. For if you take it abstractly as perform'd in our Nature, by

---

\* See Mr. N. Mather's Two Sermons on Rom. 3. 22.

the Man Christ Jesus, so it is a *Finite* Righteousness. And the *Infinite Worth* mentioned before, issues in an *Infinite Well-pleasedness* in the Heart of God himself, and is laid forth in the Justification of *many* thereby. (2.) In that as Mediator, He hath a Righteousness peculiar to Himself, arising from the Discharge of the Work of Mediation. And hence, tho' it is the Righteousness of the *Mediator* that is made over to Believers; yet it is not the *Mediatorial* Righteousness. \* For the Obedience of Christ had a twofold Respect: It had a Respect to the Law of Mediation, which was between the Father and Him, and which He was under; and it had Respect to the Law which we had broken, and which He was made under for our Sakes. In this latter Regard only it is made over to others. (3.) In that this very Righteousness whereby we are justify'd, is *Originally His*: He fulfilled it, and not we. The whole World was guilty of *Adam's* first Sin, and are Sinners thereby; yet it was He personally committed the Fact, and destroyed the whole World, which no other did. So Christ alone wrought out this Righteousness by himself, and justify'd many. This shall be Sacred to thee, O Jesus, and this shall be to thy Honour for ever and ever! *Joshua* is marvelous fine when his own filthy Garments are taken away, and change of Raiment given him, *Zech.* 3. 4, 5. (4.) The *Fulness* of Righteousness, and Justifying Grace is in Him, and no where else.

I might have argued from the Parallel of the two *Adams*, further to shew, that the *very Righteousness* of Christ is a Believer's justifying Righteousness: But I shall have Occasion to touch it under the next.

---

\* See Mr. Mather's 2 Sermons p. 4. 5.



II. *That this Righteousness is Imputed to all Believers, it is unto and upon them.* The Way in which it becomes theirs is by *Imputation*. This I take to be the Doctrine of Protestant Divines, as with one Consent, 'till of late, Disputations have been raised about it, and the Word [*Imputed*] has been excepted against. I cannot perswade my self, that this Doctrine was professed, and urged by our Reformers rashly, or in too great a Zeal against the Popish Doctrine of Works; nor yet that the Body of Protestant Divines of greatest Piety and penetrating Judgments, were at unawares led into the Mistake: Nor can this Doctrine be relinquished without giving up the Cause to Popery again, in the Article of Justification. \*

It matters nothing in how many Senses the Word [*Imputed*] may be used; the Meaning of it here is clear and evident, if we compare it with the Imputation of *Adam's Sin* to all his Posterity, and, with the Imputation of *our Sins* to Christ.

I. *Compare it with the Imputation of Adam's Sin to all his Posterity.* Rom. 5. 12, 13. *Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned.* Hence it follows, Infants have Sinned, for they Dye. *Death passeth upon them,* not for any Personal Sin of theirs; but it is to be resolved into *that immediately fore-going, by one Man Sin enter'd into the World, and Death by Sin.* This then is the universal Law; where Sin is there Death comes, and no where else. It is therefore in the Force of the first Man's Transgression,

---

\* The Article of Justification being lost, all true Christian Doctrine is lost with it. *Luther.*

*in whom all have Sinned, as in the Margin. And may be Read, \* In him in whom all have Sinned.*

Ver. 13. *For until the Law, Sin was in the World, but Sin is not imputed where there is no Law. I take the Apostle's Argument to stand thus, Where there is no Law there is no Sin imputed : But Sin was imputed before the giving of the Law, [viz. on Sinai,] Therefore there was some Law by which it was so imputed. Now this was the Law given to Adam, and transgressed by him. So that (1.) The Sin which was imputed, spoken of in this Context, is Another Man's Sin, that is, Adam's. I need not contend whether it is that only. It is enough that that is included. For he speaks of Sin which entred by One Man, and by Virtue of which, Death passed upon all, Infants not excepted, as we see daily, who doubtless are intended in Ver. 14. which demonstrates Adam's Head-ship as a Publick Person. (2.) The Imputation is the Charge of another Man's Sin, by Virtue of some Law, wherein both Head and Members, Father and Children were comprehended. All Men were concern'd in one Covenant, in one Law, in which Adam stood for all. The Breach and Transgression of the Law is reckoned to them all, and all are accounted Transgressors in the Offence of One, who was legally and virtually † All Men. Hence (saith the Apostle) v. 15. Thro' the Offence of One [not of many] many are Dead. Ver. 16. The Judgement was by One to Condemnation. Ver. 17. By one Man's Offence Death reigned by one. Ver. 18. By the offence of ONE, Judgement came upon all Men to Condemnation. Here's not only a Propagation*

---

\* ἐφ' ᾧ the Antecedent αὐτῷ being understood in the Relative; as Luk. 6. 34. παρ' οὗ [to them of whom] Joh. 10. 36. οὗ [him whom] Rom. 9. 15. 2 Cor. 2. 3. ἀφ' οὗ [from them of whom.] and very frequently with and without Prepositions in both Numbers; which relieves the Objection about the Distance of the Antecedent.

† Omnes eramus ille unus homo.

of

of Sin from Father to Child, but clearly a *Law-charge* of his Sin upon All, by Virtue of a *Publick Capacity* that he stood in. \* And if Men will argue against the Righteousness or Justice hereof, it is but to open their Mouths against God, and dispute his Proceedings.

2. *Compare it with the Imputation of our † Sins to Jesus Christ.* These do mutually illustrate each other, and the one cannot be deny'd without the Overthrow of the other. The Imputation of our Sins to Christ is founded in his being *made under the Law*, and his being accepted of God *in our stead*. It is true, Christ was under the Law by the Father's Constitution, and his own Voluntary Susception, which were Acts of the highest Gospel-Grace; otherwise the Law could not have Reached him, to impute Sin unto Him; but being under it in our stead, it charged Sin upon him.

It will be said then, *Did God dispense with his Law, which required Personal Obedience, and threatened the Man himself who sinned with Death?* I answer, God of his Authority and Wisdom put Christ in our stead; He had a Way for it; and then Christ was the Person. Thus he dispenced not with the Law || in any of its Precepts; but only admitted *Another* to do and suffer what the Law required of *us*. In this he acted as above the Law, but receded not from it. Christ was made under the Law, put in our Place, in the most express Manner imaginable. The Law suffers no Wrong, God loses no Glory, by this Exchange: Nay, when he was the *Son of God incarnate*, who was thus under the Law for us, how is the *Law magnified and made honourable?* Isa. 42. 21.

---

\* Adam was a Type of Christ who was to come. Rom. 5. 14.

† Isa. 53 6. 2 Cor. 5. 21.

|| See Reynolds on Pl. 106. 4 P. 449 and 450. 4to.

Here then we may take the Measures of what is intended by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness. As it is the Sin of *Another*, which is imputed to all Men, tho' they had not personally committed it; so the Righteousness of *Another Man*, even Christ, is imputed unto many. And as it was in the Virtue of *Adam's Publick Capacity*, that the Law charged his Sin; so by Virtue of *Christ's Publick Capacity*, God imputes his Righteousness. Again, Sin imputed to Christ was the Sin of others, *not his own*; so it is the Righteousness of *Another*, *not our own*, that is imputed for Justification. And as it was *Grace* that accepted Christ in our stead, that our Sin and *Punishment* should be on him; so it is *Grace* whereby his *Righteousness* is accepted for us, and put upon us. Lastly, As Christ's *Substitution* into our Place is the Foundation of the Imputation of our Sins to Him; so also, of the Imputation of his Righteousness unto us. For when Christ was a Surety and common Person, engaged to satisfy, the Debts of his Elect must needs be put on his Account: And that satisfaction being made *in our stead*, nothing can hinder the Imputation of it, in the appointed Time and Way.

The Learned and Judicious Mr. *Clarkson* disputes;  
 \* That the *Acceptance* for us of Christ's Righteousness, as performed in our stead, is all which is meant by Imputation—— The Imputation of that which is *Good*, is called the *Accepting* it for us; as the Imputation of that which is *Evil*, is called the *Laying* it to our Charge, 2 *Tim.* 4. 16. ———  
 When a Friend pays a Ransom for a Captive, if it be Accepted for the Captive, it is imputed to him, &c. Other Things he discourses there so nervously that I think are fully satisfying, and not capable of an Answer: To which I refer the Reader.



It is Objected; *If the Obedience of Christ were performed for us, so in our stead, as if we had done it, where is Imputation then, any otherwise than if we had done it? And if it is all one as if we had done it, then are we reputed to be our own Saviours.* Answ. This is the perverse Disputing of Men of Corrupt Minds. It doth not follow that we obey'd in our own Persons, but only that we obey'd in him; that he obey'd for us in our stead; not we for our selves. And it is all one as if we had done it, only in Point of Privilege; the Law and Justice of God taking it for a full Payment on our behalf; and not as to the Honour or Preheminence arising from Personal Performance, which belongs to Christ only.

All the Writings of the Reformers, and of the greatest Divines after them, do testifie that they have embraced this Doctrine of Imputation of Righteousness.

My Opinion (saith \* one of them) of Christ's Righteousness, is this; We have all sinned in Adam, without our own Consent and Works, and we are loosed from Sin thro' Christ, without our own Works or Deservings—— Thro' Adam, his Sin was counted for our own; thro' Christ, his Righteousness is imputed to us for our own. See also Luther on Gal. 2. 20. and on c. 4. 4.

Verily (saith † Another) whosoever rejecting the Righteousness of Christ, whereof I speak, leads us aside unto any other manner of Righteousness, I say that he pleads not for Righteousness; but against it, and doth not undertake the Defence of the Law of God, but is a professed Enemy of the

\* John Frith a Martyr in the Reign of King Henry 8. against Rastell. p. 49.

† Fox, Author of the Book of Martyrs, against Olorius. p. 7.

' Grace of Christ and his Cross, and therefore doth  
 ' not open, but shut up all Passages of true Salvati-  
 ' on, and all Gates and Doors of Divine Grace.  
 And elsewhere, ' As Christ was made Sin, so are  
 ' we made Righteous, but Christ was not made Sin,  
 ' by inherent Sin; therefore we also are not made  
 ' Righteous, by inherent Righteousness. And from  
 Rom. 5. he disputeth, (p. 18.) ' As the Sin of one,  
 ' Adam—— so the Righteousness of Christ is Im-  
 ' puted to all his Posterity, viz. that Believe in him,  
 ' tho' they did not obey with him. And very liberally  
 he uses the Word [*Imputation*] which Men begin now  
 to be afraid of.

' The Sons of the Papacy (as this same Author ob-  
 ' serves, p. 266.) do in no wise endure this Imputa-  
 ' tion. Why so? *Andradus*, together with *Mon-*  
 ' *hemius*, and the *Cognists*, think it an unworthy  
 ' thing, that any Man should be called Righteous  
 ' by another Man's Righteousness, \* which is not  
 ' inherent in himself. *Tiletanus* cries, that it is  
 ' more than absurd, and that it has not been heard  
 ' of in the World, that *that* can be the true Form  
 ' of any thing which is not in it. As if a Man  
 ' should call *Cicero* Courageous, with the Courage  
 ' which is not in himself, but in the Mind of  
 ' *Achilles*. †

Nor does Mr. *Baxter* || speak less offensively when he  
 says, ' It is not only false that the formal Righte-  
 ' ousness of Christ is made our formal Righteousness;  
 ' but it is as impossible as that the Accident of one  
 ' should be formally the Accident of another. The  
 ' Righteousness of Christ is consider'd materially

\* Acts 4. 27 Against thy holy Child Jesus, Herod, Pontius Pi-  
 late, with the Gentiles, &c.

† Vid. etiam Davenant, in Col. 2. 10. p. 196.

|| Method. Theol. Partis 3. c. 27. p. 322.

and formally. It is our material Righteousness in the Sense before explain'd, that is, the Meritorious Cause of our formal Righteousness. They who assert it to be our formal Righteousness, are altogether ignorant what they say, and what is the Form of Righteousness: And as the Papists have irreconcilably alienated the Reformed from them in no way more than by obtruding the Impossibilities and Contradictions of Transubstantiation, as an Article of Faith upon the Churches: So also, some Erroneous Protestants have render'd the Papists irreconcilable to us in no way more than by setting forth these impossible and absurd Things, concerning Imputed Righteousness, as a most necessary part of the Gospel. This Erroneous Opinion has its Original in many from an ill Understanding of the Union between Christ and Believers, &c.

I confess we are not to adhere to the Judgment of the Reformers, nor of any Man, or Men whatsoever, in every Point; We should be improving the Doctrines deliver'd to us by them from the Scriptures, and going forward; But when Men are deserting those very Doctrines which the Foundation of the Protestant Churches was laid upon, in Opposition to Popery, and seem enclined to a \* Reconciliation, in many Doctrines of greatest Importance; this looks to me very sad, and is a great Argument of a woful Degeneracy, and also Presage of some further Scourge from the Synagogue of Rome; unless the Spirit of God recovers us.

III. I am to shew, *That this Righteousness of Christ is upon all them that believe without Difference; so that*

---

\* Mr. John Humphrey has a Pamphlet entituled, *The Middle Way between Protestant and Papist*, in a Paper of Justification, honour'd with the Names of Mr. Baxter and Dr. Manton.

there are no Degrees of Justification, either as to different Persons, or as to the same Person at different Times.

The Scheme which the *New Methodists* have laid, leads to the contrary Opinion: For when our Justification (according to them) is by our *Gospel-Works*, or *Sincere Obedience*, and when it is certain that one Christian goes beyond another, in Grace and Obedience: Hence it will follow, that either He that is weaker is not perfectly Justify'd; or else he that is stronger has something *over and above*, beyond what is required by this New Law; or there must be Degrees in Justification, as there are in Sanctification, it must be a *Gradual Work*. If something in us (I say) be the Matter of our Justification, as Faith, Sincerity, or whatsoever else; of Necessity, according to the *Measure* and *Degree* thereof, such will be the *Measure* of our Justification. And whereas that is imperfect which they call our *Gospel-Righteousness*, our *Justification* will unavoidably be so. Nor do they fear to own it, but plainly \* say, That our Justification at present, while we are in this World, is but *Partial*, *Imperfect* and *Incomplete*; and that we shall not obtain full, compleat, entire, and final Justification from all the Effects of Sin, until the Day of Judgment.

But now in Opposition hereto, I shall endeavour to Prove, (1.) That the *weakest* Believer is justified as fully as He that is *strongest*. (2.) That both are already fully and compleatly justify'd.

1. That the *weakest* Believer is justify'd equally, as he that has the most Faith of all. I take this to be expressly affirmed, in *Rom. 3. 22, 23*. There he asserts, that the *Righteousness* of God, which is by Faith of *Jesus Christ*, is unto all and upon all them that Believe.

---

\* Mr. Clark in his Book forementioned. p. 18.



What needs any Man more? Hence the Saints are Priests to God, being cloathed with this Priestly Robe, the Righteousness of Christ, \* they are *cloathed with the Sun*. And they are not only some, but *ALL*, not only *stronger* but *weaker* Believers, unto whom this Righteousness is imputed and apply'd: *For there is no Difference*. Every Believer has *equally* the Advantage and Benefit of that Righteousness. There is no Difference in the *Righteousness* it self, it is the *Righteousness* of God; nor in the Reality of its *Imputation*, It is *unto all*, and *upon all*, &c. nor in the *Means* of our receiving it, which is *by the Faith of Jesus Christ*; Neither therefore in the *Effect*, viz. Justification. V. 23. *For all have Sinned*: They have therefore no Righteousness of their *own*, but do all alike need Another's Righteousness. And as they have *Sinned* in *Adam* without Difference; so they who believe have a *Righteousness* without Difference in *Jesus Christ*.

For the further Proof of this Point, I shall only mention what might be enlarged on. (1.) It has already been proved, that it is the *very Righteousness* of Christ it self, which is imputed to Believers. And if so, *that Righteousness* being unto, and upon all Believers equally, the *Effect* thereof in Justification must needs be the same. They who have the *same* justifying Righteousness upon them, must needs be *equally* Justified therein. (2.) The Nature of Faith in all Believers is the same. 2 Pet. 1. 1. *To them that have obtained like precious Faith with us, in the Righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.* † All Christians had not like *strong* Faith, equal Degrees of Faith with the Apostles; but the weakest Believer had, and has like *precious* Faith. (3.) The Privileges

\* Rev. 12. 1. compare Mal. 4. 2.

† ἐν δίκαιοσύνῃ

which all Believers are possessed of, are always spoken of as *without Difference*. *Justification*; Acts 13. 39. *All that believe are justify'd*. True, one Man believes more strongly, steadily, firmly: What of that? If the Word of God be true, *ALL that believe are justify'd*, and that *from all things*, &c. And what can be more? *Adoption*. Joh. 1. 12. *To as many as received him*; this is the Property of all true Faith, even the weakest; *To them gave he Power to become the Sons of God*: Not only to *strong* Believers, but to *All* who receive him, in equal Manner. Lastly, *Eternal Life*, in the Beginning of it, and a *Title* to the highest Enjoyment thereof. 1 Joh. 5. 11. 12. Joh. 3. 16. So that this Notion of a gradual Justification is contrary to the whole Scripture, and by that, one may judge of the Doctrine which leads to such an Opinion.

2. *That every true Believer is perfectly justify'd*. For, what is the meaning of an incompleat, Imperfect Justification? Imperfect Obedience we know in our selves, and Imperfect Holiness we know to our Sorrow, which shall indeed be Perfected at Death and Judgment. But an Incompleat Discharge from Condemnation, what is the meaning of that? Is it a Discharge or no Discharge? Incompleat Pardon, and Acceptance with God, Is it Pardon, is it Acceptance or not? An Imperfect Title to Salvation, will you call it a Title, or no Title? If it be incompleat in God's Account, it is next to none. When God saith, *He that believes is justified*: Shall the Meaning be, he is *half* justified, or *shall be justify'd* at the Day of Judgment? When God saith, *There is no Condemnation*, &c. Shall the Meaning be, there is no *Compleat* Condemnation, only some Danger of it till a Man has wove thro' the Web of Imperfect Obedience? Surely the Apostle did not Triumph in vain, Rom. 8. v. 33, 34. upon that Ground, that *whom God did foreknow, he also did Predestinate, and whom he Predestinated, he also Cal-*  
led

led, and whom he Called, them he also justify'd, and whom he justify'd them he also Glorified. Here Justification is inseparably connected with Calling. Who-soever is Called, is also Justify'd. Heaven and Earth may be shaken sooner than these immoveable Pillars can be shaken, or justled out of their Place. Again, every justify'd one shall be glorify'd. Not glorify'd first (as Men are at the Resurrection, *Phil.* 3. 21. when some say our full Justification is to be.) but first justify'd, then glorify'd. Hereon he makes that bold Challenge, *Who shall lay any thing to the Charge of God's Elect?* Ver. 33, 34. There is no Charge, no Indictment which is valid, to be brought in against them. *Imperfect* Justification is but cold Comfort for a Believer; it is no Cordial of Christ's Preparing, who would have the Joy of his Disciples to be full, *Joh.* 15. 11.

But why will they have our Justification to be incomplete? Because truly the Terms of the new Law are not altogether fulfill'd. God will first see how we persevere, e're he justifies. When Christ is excluded, and something in our selves made our justifying Righteousness, it must needs be thus. But all the lower Links of this Blessed Chain, *Calling, Justification and Glorification*, which are in Time, do hang upon, and flow from an *Eternal Predestination*, an Immutable Fore-knowledge. Again, These two, Justification and Glorification are put so close together, as if nothing came between; *whom he justified them he also glorified*: It is true, the Holiness and Obedience of adult Believers comes between: But God having such an Hold of them whom he justifies, and the Covenant of Grace being so orderd in all things and sure; and Justification being a full Title to the whole of Salvation; the Holy Ghost, for our strong Consolation, has joyned them thus together, *whom he justified he glorified, they are secur'd of Glory*, *1 Pet.* 1. 5.

## C H A P. VI.

*Proving, That Faith is not the Matter of our Justification, nor Meritorious Cause of it; but is used therein only as an Instrument, not as a Work.*

**I**N Treating of Faith in this great Point, I would shew, (1.) That Faith is not our *Righteousness*, which either by it self as a Work, doth justify, or together with any other Gospel-Works whatsoever. (2.) That Faith justifies only as a Means of Receiving the Lord Jesus Christ and his *Righteousness*, *i. e.* merely in Relation to its Object.

I. *Faith is not our Justifying Righteousness, by which alone, or by it self, we are Justified.* For,

1. This would pervert the true Notion of *Justification*. Our Justification were not then by Imputation of *Another's Righteousness*; unless it be by Imputation of *two Righteousnesses*, and those Infinitely different from each other. But certain it is, that Christ's *Righteousness*, and another Kind of *Righteousness* cannot stand together in our Justification. If Christ be our *Righteousness*, Faith is not. And hence They who would have Faith and Gospel-Works to justify, do seek to debase and pervert those \* Texts where Christ's *Righteousness* is spoken of referring them to his *Kingly Office* only; or Interpreting [*God's Righteousness*] to mean only a Way of his Appointment, and that is by our *own Righteousness*; or teaching that Christ's Obedience has procured that ours should be accepted in Justification. All

---

\* Such as Jer. 23. 6. Rom. 5. 19. Phil. 3. 8, 9. &c.



which do greatly derogate from, and abase Christ's Righteousness, making it to have a Servile Work and Use. For thus our own Righteousness and Gospel-Works, come nearest us in our Justification; and the Righteousness of Christ, is only procurative that these should justify us.

2. To make the very Act of Believing to Justify, destroys the true Nature and End of *Sanctification* also. Sanctification, or at least some Part or Branch of it, would be our Justification, or Justifying Righteousness. So that here would be a confounding of those two great Points. It doth not satisfy to say, that Justification is the *Acceptance* of this Faith, or whatsoever else in us, to be our Justifying Righteousness, and *declaring* a Man righteous thereupon; and so differs from *that wherein* he is declarad Righteous. For then altho' *Justification* and *Sanctification* would thus have a *Notional* Difference; yet they differ only as *Justification* and *Justifying Righteousness*; and still *Righteousness* and *Sanctification* are made to be the same Thing, absolutely the same, contrary to 1 Cor. 1. 30. *Who of God is made to us—Righteousness, Sanctification*; where they are clearly distinguished. Justification is an *Effect* of Righteousness but it is of *Christ's* Righteousness. *His* Righteousness is ours for *Justification*; and besides that, He is made *Sanctification* to us. Sanctification is a *Work* in the Soul; Justification is an *Act* of God towards it, thro' the Righteousness of Christ put upon it.

3. This Doctrine perverteth the true Nature of *Faith*, in the matter of Justifying. For, whereas it is opposed to the *Law*, and to *all Works*, it cannot it self be transformed into a Work, and stand as such in our Justification. It is clearly the *Design* of the Apostle *Pau*, in mentioning of it, to exclude *all Works* in this matter. But now if Faith it self be made our

Justifying Righteousness, it is a *meer Work*, and is of the *Law*; and opposite to the Design of *Grace*, and the Righteousness of *Christ*, as much as any thing else. And let Men give what Account they will, or can of Faith, unless it be a *Resting* and *Trusting* in *Another* for Righteousness, and in the Righteousness of *Another* performed to our Hand; and I'll venture to say, *it is of the Law*, and is a *Work*; and will oppose it, as a meer legal thing; for it is conformable to the Righteousness of the *Law*: *The Man that doth these things shall live by them.* But take Faith as it looks out to *Christ*, seeks Righteousness in *Him*, rests there alone; and thus, *The Just shall live by Faith*, in, and on *Another*; or else he doth not live by Faith, whatsoever he lives by. Dr. Goodwin puts this Question, 'Whether it be the Act of Faith that Justifies, or that is accounted a Man's Righteousness, when we are said to be saved thro' Faith?' \* He answers, 'Surely, no: For God might have taken Works as well; if he would have taken it as an Act, he might have taken any Act, Love it self. And I'll hint here, That Love has a greater Excellency in it, even than Faith. † As they both belong to our Sanctification, Love is the greater, and indeed was too great for God to use in our Justification, when he intended to magnifie Grace. But those who would admit Faith it self, as a Work, to justifie, let them keep out Love and other Works, if they can; but one thing is, they go not about it. Had the Apostle intended to bring in Works with Faith, he would not have opposed Faith to them all, and in express Words have excluded them. There is this Reason (proceeds the Doctor)

\* Goodwin on Ephes. Part. II. p. 301. † 1 Cor. 13. 13.

' lies in the Bottom of my Spirit against it, be-  
 ' sides all that else the Scripture has against it,  
 ' that if when I go to God to be justify'd, I  
 ' must present to him my believing, as the mat-  
 ' ter of my Righteousness, and Christ's Death  
 ' only as the Merit of it, what will follow?  
 ' Two Things clearly to me; (1.) That the  
 ' Heart is taken off from looking upon the  
 ' Righteousness of Christ wholly, and diverts to  
 ' its own Righteousness in the very Act of Be-  
 ' lieving for Righteousness, and presents that to  
 ' God which the Scripture is clear against——  
 ' (2.) Every Man that will Believe to be justi-  
 ' fy'd, and go to God, and say, Lord, justifie  
 ' me, must then have an Evidence that he hath  
 ' Faith; for how else can he present *that* as the  
 ' matter of his own Righteousness. Now Milli-  
 ' ons of Souls cannot do this; they were in a  
 ' poor Case if they should be put to it. The  
 ' Apostle saith, It is of Faith, *that it might be*  
 ' *sure*, &c. If Justification had been founded on  
 ' the Act of Faith, it had been as sure on Works  
 ' as Faith: For that Faith which draws out an  
 ' Act of Love, is as apt to fail as that Act of  
 ' Love. But here is no uncertainty, while I  
 ' believe to be justify'd by the Righteousness of  
 ' Christ, but my Faith is swallow'd up there.  
 ' Tho' I may doubt of my Faith relying on  
 ' him; yet I have a sure Object, I have a sure Matter  
 ' to represent to God for me. Whereas if Believing  
 ' were *that* I had to represent to God to be justify'd  
 ' by, suppose my Faith fail me, I have not a sure mat-  
 ' ter of Righteousness to represent to God. The very  
 ' Object that Faith believes on, is a Contradiction to  
 ' this, that the Act of Faith should be the Mat-  
 ' ter of my Justification. So that verily the true  
 ' Nature of Faith is destroyed by this Opinion, for

it is made to turn aside from its Object, and turn in unto it self for Justification, and so doth not give all the Honour unto Christ its Object, which is the Nature of true Faith.

It is objected, that the Apostle saith, *Faith is imputed for Righteousness*, Rom. 4. 5, 9. I answer, It is the *Object* of Faith that is intended. It may not be understood of Faith in such a Sense as to exclude its Object. I grant, It is not absolutely and adæquately the same, as if it were said that *Christ is imputed for Righteousness*. But thus, God looks upon them that Believe as Righteous as if they had kept the whole Law, not for their Faith's sake, but upon the Account of that Righteousness which is apprehended thereby. Faith is said to be imputed, because in Believing the Soul has the Benefit of a perfect Righteousness, unto and upon him, which he had not before Believing; and not because Faith is that Righteousness. It is *Christ received by Faith, Christ believed on*. He who owns that Faith presenteth Christ's Obedience to God for Acceptance and Justification, must grant the whole, that it is Christ himself believed on who justifies. Our Saviour sometimes useth that Expression, *Thy Faith hath saved thee; thy Faith hath made thee whole*, Mark 10. 52. Luke 7. 50. Who would now impute so much to Faith, as to Derogate from Christ? to whom all the Praise of the Healing Virtue, and of Healing it self, was due. Yet it cannot be deny'd that the Mercy and Benefit was convey'd in a Way of Believing, and was not enjoy'd before.

Further, As it is not Faith it self, by it self, which justifies, so neither is it Faith together with any other Gospel-Works or Performances. It is all one in this matter as to the Honour of Christ concern'd



concern'd therein, whether Men say, it is Faith pregnant with good Works, and as the Principle of them all, (so that they are virtually included) or whether they admit them as *actually* performed. And some are sufficiently bold to assert, that Gospel-Works in our Justification are not Derogatory from Grace, and that the Apostle never intended to exclude them: So that Conversion it self, and the good Works following thereupon, shall justify a Man: For Faith (they say) is the same with Regeneration and the new Creature; or, as some express it, an *Owning of, and Consent unto*, I know not what, *Baptismal Vow*; the very same with Christianity. But I have this against it, that hereby the *Covenant of Grace is transform'd and turn'd into a Covenant of Works*. Nor will the plausible Name of a *Gospel-Law*, and *Gospel-Works* salve the Business. It is a *Law* still, and they are *Works* still, it is a new *Covenant of Works*, and therefore *not of Grace*, Rom. ii. 6. Which Doctrine, that you may see it to be *altogether Popish*, and the same which was opposed in the first Reformation by our *Protestant Divines*, I shall lay before the Reader some Passages of a Discourse of Dr. Barnes upon this Head, [*Only Faith justifies before God.*] \* But peradventure, (saith he) here will be said, that Paul condemneth the Works of the *Old Law*, but not the Works of the *New Law*. Are you now satisfy'd in your Conscience? Think you that you have well assailed St. Paul's Argument?— Think you that you shall be thus discharged before God? If you do, then go boldly into the strait Judgment of God with this Evasion; and doubt

---

\* Dr. Barnes was a Martyr in the Reign of King Hen. 8. This Discourse is bound up with the Works of Tindal and Erith. See p. 228, 229. Fol. 100. not,

not, but there you shall find *St. Paul* as stiffy,  
 and as strongly against you, and your *New*  
 Works, as ever he was against the Jews, and  
 their *Old Works* — What Works can you  
 do or devise, that be good, which be not in  
 the *Old Law*? *Ergo*, he speaks of *all manner*  
 of Works, for the *Law* includes *All Works*  
 that ever God instituted. The highest and best—  
 of all Works, be the Works of the Ten Com-  
 mandments: \* And these be the Works of the  
 Old Law, and cannot justifie, after your own  
 Saying, [meaning the *Papists*.] Now what Works  
 have you of the *New Law*, other than these?  
 or better than these? — But now grant that  
 there be certain Works of the *New Law*, which  
 be not of the *Old*; yet you cannot prove that  
 these shall justifie. For there can be no more  
 Goodness in [any] Works, than were in  
 Works of the *Old Law*; for they were to God's  
 Honour, and to the Profit of our Neighbour.  
 What Goodness can Works have more? And  
 yet you grant that *they* cannot justifie: How then  
 shall your *New Works* justifie? Blessed *St. Paul*  
 disputes against them that were † Christen'd,  
 and had both Works of the *Old Law*, and also  
 of the *New*; and yet concludeth he, that Christ  
 alone was their Justifier. Mark his Argument,  
*If Righteousness cometh of the Law, then is Christ dead*  
*in vain.* As he would say, If the *Law* help to ju-  
 stifie (for that was the Opinion of the Jews) then  
 is not Christ alone your Justifier. If He be not your  
 Justifier alone, then is he *Dead in vain* — For  
 he will have no *Helper*. Now will I take this  
 Argument of *St. Paul*, and likewise dispute against  
 your *New Works*. If *New Works* do help to  
 justify, then is Christ dead in vain, &c. Where-

---

\* *Opera Decalogi.* † Baptized. fore

fore no *Manner of Works*, whether they be in Faith or out of Faith, can help to justify. Nevertheless, Works have their Glory and Reward; but the Glory and Praise of Justification belongs to Christ only. He disputes also from *Rom. 4. 4.* and with many other Arguments shews that Works have no Hand at all in Justifying; but Faith alone in Opposition to them all. It is true, Faith is the Principle of all Obedience, but none of that Obedience is in the least interested in our Justification.

II. Faith justifies only as a Means of Receiving the Lord Jesus Christ, and his Righteousness; it is spoken of Faith merely in Relation to its Object. If this can be made good, then all the Disputes that Men raise about the *Ingredients*, and *Acts* of Justifying Faith, are render'd useless at once. If Faith justifie as our *Gospel-Righteousness*, then indeed there is no doubt but \* *Assent*, and *Consent*, *Knowledge*, *Choice*, *Affiance* and *Obedience*, (with perhaps Twenty Things more) are included in it. But if *Christ* be our *Righteousness* in very Deed, (which I hope is proved) then Faith can justify only as an *Instrument*; and its Act is *Receiving*, and *Trusting* in that Righteousness of Christ. So that the meaning of Justification by Believing, is only this, (1.) That no Unbeliever is *Personally* justify'd. (2.) That a Soul is justify'd *Personally*, not by Christ *absolutely*, but by Christ *Applied*. (3.) That the Spirit applicth Christ in the Work of Faith, and Faith is that whereby Souls do *Receive* Christ, and his Righteousness, *John 1. 12. Col. 2. 6.* And when it has this Use, it is that whereon God will pass a legal

---

\* *Clark of Justific. 2. 57.*

Act of Justifying, and according to Revealed Rules in the Word, account a Man Righteous as clothed with that Righteousness which it receives. For it is the Nature of Faith to give away all the Glory from the Creature to the Son of God.

A little further to explain this Matter. If you take the Latitude of Christ's Work and Office as Saviour, He hath other Offices besides his *Priestly*, and other Work besides the bringing in Righteousness; yet it is not the Discharge of his *Prophetical*, or *Kingly* Office, that justifies, but his Performances as our great *High-Priest*. (Nothing detracting from his other Offices.) So now, Faith has other Acts, and works other ways, besides dealing with Christ in his *Priestly* Office, by Receiving and Trusting; yet it is no where else that it seeks Justification, nor any other way that it justifies; nor doth this detract from its Usefulness in other Points.

Men may also dispute, that these, and those things are necessary as *Preparations* to all Acts of saving Faith; and doubtless Hearing the Word is so, and the Spirit's Working thereby: They may also speak \* of such and such *Acts of Faith*, as necessary to an *Act of Trust* and Affiance: But after all, It may be not many will deny, that God may make a saving Turn in the Heart of a Sinner under *one* Sermon, or by some one Expression thereof. That he hath done so, I can prove; and that he often does so, I no way doubt. Also that Trusting in Christ is as early an Act of saving Faith as any other, I am perswaded. The contrary Opinion overturns the Order given by Christ, *John* 16. 8, 9, 10. *Conviction of Righteousness*, which respects the Priesthood of Christ, goes before *Conviction of Judgment*, which respects his *Kingly* Office. *Righteousness* is the thing that suits a

---

\* *Clark* p. 59, 60.



guilty perplexed Sinner. And Victory over Sin and Satan, which is meant by [*Judgment*] is a sweet and suitable Discovery, when the Soul hath spy'd the Way of Justification; for this is the next Thing the Heart is concern'd about. Thus naturally does a Saving Trust in Christ work unto Holiness. Also that a Saving Conviction of a lost and miserable State, is necessarily contain'd in the *Work* of Faith, and doth precede all Acts of Believing (or else that a Soul would not come to Christ) is to me very clear. But they who make *Faith* and Inherent *Holiness* to be a Gospel-Justifying Righteousness, either have not seen in a saving Manner, their altogether lost and miserable State in themselves, (as having neither Righteousness nor Strength) and their absolute Necessity of Christ and his Righteousness *alone*, or else the inward Experience and Practice of their Souls, is contrary to their avowed Opinions; which latter, Charity inclines me to hope.

But I say, if it be agreed in what *Capacity* Faith justifies, whether as our Gospel-Righteousness or no, the Dispute about what *Act* of Faith it is that justifies, will fall of it self. But that *Faith is not our \* Gospel-Righteousness*, and consequently that it is only *Receptive* of a Righteousness by God's Appointment for Justification, I give these Reasons.

1. What else can be the plain Meaning of such Expressions, without putting them upon the Rack of Tropes and Figures, of Christ's *bringing in an Everlasting Righteousness*, being the *Lord our Righteousness*, and by his Obedience shall many be *† constituted*

---

\* Mr. Clark P. 64. maintains that Faith is our Gospel-Righteousness, whose Arguments I here intend an Answer to, by turning them upon himself. Compare this Answer with his Book.

\* *κατασταθῆναι* The same Word is used, *Acts* 6. 3. and 7. 10, 27. It doth not signify a certain Physical Operation but a Legal Constitution, an Act of Power and Authority.

*Righteous*, but that *He himself* is our whole and entire Righteousness? that as the *Law* requires, so the *Gospel* exhibits a Perfect Obedience : Wherefore Faith is only a Receiver in this Matter.

2. Because the *Apostle* frequently opposes Faith, and Works of the *Law* in this Case. As *Gal.* 3. 11, 12. *Rom.* 3. 27 For certain it is that Faith as a Work is required in the *Law*, *Mat.* 23. 23. and it is opposed to the *Law*, only in the matter of Justifying, only as to *Trusting* in *Another's* Obedience. The *Law* saith, *Do this and live* ; but the *Gospel* saith, *Seek Righteousness wholly in Another by Believing*. This is a Way indeed which the *Law* knew nothing of.

3. Because it is not only called the *Righteousness of Faith*, *Rom.* 4. 11. But *Righteousness Reveal'd to Faith*, *Rom.* 1. 17. which therefore could not be Faith it self ; and *Righteousness BY Faith, UNTO all, and UPON all that believe*, *Chap.* 3. 22. that is by Faith sought after, seen and received, *Heb.* 11. 7. *Gal.* 2. 16, 17. *Acts* 26. 18.

4. Because there is no New Law, No Rule of Righteousness whatsoever, requiring only sincere Believing and Obeying, and not Perfect Doing. Therefore Faith cannot be a Gospel-Righteousness, for that it bears Conformity to no such Rule. Obedience was to be performed to the *Law* for Justification ; for that was, and cannot cease to be the Rule and Standard of all justifying Righteousness : Now nothing is done in the *Gospel* to Debase, but to honour and magnify the *Law*, neither doth the *Gospel* come Commanding, and calling for a Righteousness for Justification, but *Revealing* a Righteousness ready wrought out, *Rom.* 1. 16. 17. and 5. 17. If it requires a Righteousness to be wrought by us, I would fain know, how it comes *Revealing* a Righteousness, and that to Faith, which it would not do, but to *Natural Conscience*, if it were the Way of Works?

5. This

3. This Truth is exceeding clear from the Apostle's Discourse in Rom. 10. from ver. 3. to the 10th\*. He charges it on the Jews, as their great Sin, that they did not submit to God's Righteousness, but went about to establish their own; it is a Thing Men may go about to do, but can never bring about. Any Thing that is a Man's own is opposite to this Righteousness of God. For (saith he) Christ is the End of the Law, the Perfecting End thereof as a Law, the Abolishing End, as it was a Covenant, for Righteousness † or unto Righteousness, the bringing in of Righteousness, which is the Issue of his Obedience; To every one that Believes; for so it is received, and that is God's Way of making it over. And hereon it is that He gives that Description of the Righteousness of the Law and of Faith, which follows; wherein he shews, it is not by ascending nor descending, by fulfilling the Law and satisfying Justice our selves, but by Believing in what Another has done. For with the Heart Man believes unto Righteousness, unto the Enjoyment and Possession thereof. ¶ 6. Because there is but one Rule of Righteousness, and so but one Sort of Righteousness before the Tribunal of God and that is the Righteousness of his LAW. But as this is performed either by our selves, or by Another for us; so it is with Respect to us, and the Manner of its being ours, distinguished into Legal and Evangelical, the Righteousness of the Law; and the Righteousness of Faith; because the one is by Personal Performances, the other by Christ's fulfilling the Law for us, which is made over to us by Faith therein. Now these are two vastly different Ways of being Righteous, the one known in the

\* Of all Texts in the Bible, Mr. Clark chose the wrong one when he would prove his Opinion by this.

† *his δικαιοσύνη.*

Law, the other reveal'd in the Gospel. *Who is wise shall understand these Things.*

So that we are Righteous either by *Doing*, as Adam in Innocency; this is *Legal*, whether it be more or less, for that makes but a gradual Difference: Or, else Righteous by *Believing*, viz. in Christ's Righteousness which is upon us thereby, and whereon we Rely by Faith, and so are accounted Righteous; this is *Evangelical*.

Bring Christ then, and his Righteousness to God in the Arms of Faith, and thou hast a greater Treasure, than when Faith is pregnant with Ten Thousand Good Works. For Christ is to them that Believe *\* the greatest Treasure*, and their own Works and Duties *Dung* in Comparison of Him. † Remember that Word, Hab. 2. 4. || *Behold his Soul which is lifted up, is not upright in him: But the just shall live by his Faith.* Faith in Christ is the best Gospel-Sincerity, and where that is not, under a Shew of Humility, that Man's Soul is lifted up; proud of his own Righteousness, he scorns to live upon Another's; but where Faith is, the Soul is empty'd of Self, and abas'd.

I cannot allow this to be only a Subtlety, or nice Speculation, \* which has no Influence upon the Practice, one Way or other, viz. *Whether a Man holds Faith to be the Matter of his Righteousness and Justification, or only the Way and Means or the like.* For the former is clearly for Faith to set up as Co-partner at least with Jesus Christ, and overthrows the true Nature of Faith, and the End of Gospel-Works. I marvel, after this Author had disputed so much, he should come off so coldly.

\* 1 Pet. 2. 7.

† Phil. 3. 8.

|| Observe the Opposition.

\* As Mr. Clark asserteth.



It seems to me, he hardly durst venture his own Soul, on the Foundation he had laid for others. It is a vastly different Thing for Faith to lay hold on *Jesus Christ*, and present *Him* to the Father, as our alone Righteousness, before that *dreadful Tribunal*; and for it to come, and present *it self* as a Righteousness before the Throne, together with the good Works that flow from it. Yet this is the very Case: And if this is not *Practical*, there is nothing in *this World*, or with Respect to *another* which is so.

From all that has been said, it is clear, that *Faith* can by no Means be any Meritorious Cause of our *Justification*. The *Papists* ascribe something of Merit to Faith and good Works. Most *Protestants* disown the Name; but those who are for *Federal Conditions* seem to me to retain the Thing. In the *Covenant of Works*, there could be no other Merit, than what was so by *Virtue of Promise*\* made to the Performance of *Duty*. This may not be admitted in the *Covenant of Grace*. Some tell us the *Apostle Paul* excludes only *Meritorious Works*. But they consider not, that if Faith as a *Work*, or proper Condition be admitted, it is *meritorious*, for the Thing promised is due, when the Condition is performed; and that therefore Works are excluded, because if they were admitted they would bring in *Merit*.

But I have already exceeded my designed Bounds, and only add, It is best of all with them who know by Experience, *what Faith is*, they will not be so solicitous what Name to call it by, but to live upon, and to live unto the Son of God, this is *all their Desire*, and *all their Salvation*.

\* *Meritum ex Parte*

† *Rom. 4. 4. Debt, there is the Apostle's Word for Merit.*

## The CONCLUSION.

**T**HE Way of *Justification* by Christ's *Obedying the Law*, and *bearing the Curse thereof in our Stead*, not only magnifies the *Grace* and *Love of God*; but also his *Faithfulness* and *Justice* in his *Law*. An *Abatement* of what was strictly due, which the *Doctrine of the New Law* asserts, tho' it may seem to have much of *Grace* in it; yet it is dishonourable to the *Law*, and the *Truth* and *Justice* of *God* therein. Further, the *Necessity*, at least the *Certainty* of *Sanctification* and *Holiness*, is more effectually secur'd in this Way of Christ's *Obedience* in our *Stead*, than in the other Way: Because here it is made the sure *Purchase* of *Jesus Christ*, and therefore eventually must needs be the *Effect* thereof, *Tit. 2. 14.* Moreover the *Grace* of *God* in the *Gospel* teaches *Believers* to *deny Ungodliness*, &c. *ver. 11, 12.* Nor is that *Grace* savingly known where it is otherwise.

A *Work of Renovation and Sanctification* of the *Holy Ghost* is of *absolute Necessity* to all who shall be *saved*. Nor is any *Thing* intended contrary hereto, when we contend for the *Imputation* of Christ's *Righteousness*; and *Justification* thereby. Such a *Work* of the *Spirit* is, I say, necessary, not unto *Justification*; for *Justification* includes our *Title* unto *Heaven*: But necessary unto the *Possession* of the *Heavenly Inheritance*. It is no *Part* of our *Right* or *Title* thereto, but pertains to our *Meanness* and *Fitness* for the *Enjoyment* thereof. I cannot persuade my self that *God* should give *Heaven* and *Glory* upon our *Fulfilling* the *Condition*, be it what it will, *Deut. 9. 4, 5.* That which gave the *Title* at first, is all we claim it upon at last, and hold it by for ever.

Some-

Something further may be required unto the *Enjoyment* in a Way of Preparation for the Holiness of that High and Holy Place, for the immediate Enjoyment of the Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God. Holy Communion, holy Work and Employment, are altogether disagreeable to Unholy Unsanctified Ones; nor are they capable of it. It is true Believers are but in Part sanctified; but they groan to be freed from Sin and made perfectly Holy.

Further, Sanctification is to the Soul the *Passive Evidence* of his Title to Heaven; the Spirit himself is the *Active Evidence* thereof: So that they who have no *Meetness* for the Inheritance will be found at last to have no *Title* to it. There are some who speak of being Justify'd by Faith from a Charge of *Infidelity*, by Repentance, from a Charge of *Impenitency*; by Sincerity, from a Charge of *Hypocrisy*: The Sum is, at this Rate, we are Justify'd by *Sanctification*, from a Charge of being unsanctify'd, and by every *Work* and *Duty*, from a Charge of Non-performance. Surely, this is very uncouth Doctrine among Protestants: For it proposes unto us Justification to be obtain'd in a Way of *Pleading* what is in us, in Answer to a false Charge brought in I know not by whom. A false Charge it is in the Main, as to every Believer: And if in some Things it is not so, his Justification is by fleeing for Refuge to Jesus Christ. Let us remember how the *Pharisee* came off with his *Pleading*; he pleaded Performance against a Charge (perhaps) of Non-Performance. The *Publican* had nothing to Plead but Mercy, and went home justify'd, the other unjustify'd: And so will every one succeed that takes the same Course. *Gospel-Justification* is not by Pleading what *We* have done, to shuffle off a Charge; but by *owning* the Charge of the *Law*, and fleeing to the *Obedience* of *Christ*: Moreover, To account a Man a Believer,

er, or Penitent, or Sincere, who is so, this is not *Gracious Imputation*; but what is *due*, and what the Nature of the Thing requires: Nor does it more belong to Justification, than for God to account a Saint in Glory a Perfect Saint. For Justification is God's Acceptance of an Ungodly Sinner, as Righteous in his Son, *Rom. 4. 5.*

I would hope the Meaning of some may only be, that *Sanctification also is necessary unto Salvation*; that we must be made Holy, or shall not be eternally happy. But I wish they spake more of it as a Work of the Spirit of God; and not as a Performance of *Ours*, having the Nature of a pleadable Condition. It is true, a Soul that is renewed by the Spirit of God, is thereby enabled to live upon Christ, and so to Live to Him; and this is the Infallible Effect of what Christ hath done for us.

Some there have been, and those (I confess) sound Divines who have used the Terms of *Commands, Threatnings and Punishments* of the Gospel: But that they did not mean thereby to introduce any *New Law*, or establish another Righteousness than that of Christ, is clear from that of Dr. Owen, who sometimes used these Terms, 'That [Duty] which (saith he) in Respect of Motives unto it, the Ends of it, with the especial Causes of its Acceptance with God, is *Evangelical*; in Respect of its Original Prescription, Rule and Measure, is *Legal*. When any can instance in any Act or Duty, in any Habit or Effect of it, which are not required by that *Law* which enjoyns us to love the Lord our God, with all our Heart, Soul and Mind, and our Neighbour as our selves, they shall be attended to. *Owen of Justification. P. 534.* Therefore altho' Christians ought not to fall out merely about the Use of Names and Terms where there is Soundness of Judgment; yet where it is otherwise,



wife, and a New Law, and Justification by Works are introduc'd, the Difference is not about Words.

People may be much imposed upon by such a plausible Way of Arguing, Does not God accept of the Performances and Services of his People, tho' there is much Weakness and Imperfection in them? Should God stand upon Perfection, how sad would it be for us? Who should be saved, for who comes up to this? Will not he overlook the Weaknesses and Imperfections of his People, if there is Sincerity of Heart? *Ans.*

(1.) The Services of Believers done in Faith are Accepted, but are not the Ground of the Acceptation of the Person, but follow it. They are the Object of Acceptance, but not the Cause why the Person is accepted. They are Accepted, but not to the End of Justification, nor doth Justification consist therein; but is freely by Grace, thro' the Redemption of Christ Jesus. Rom. 3. 24. God had Respect first to *Abel*, then to his Offering, Gen. 4. 4. See *Mal.* 3. 3, 4. (2.) Our Services are accepted in Jesus Christ as well as our Persons. I say, both our Persons and Performances must be wrapp'd about in his most Perfect Righteousness, that they may be Accepted. And tho' God does not find a Perfect Righteousness in *Us*, yet he finds this in *Christ*, else he could not bear with our Weaknesses, and none could be saved.

Lastly Did these New Methodists own, (1.) That Christ suffer'd under the same Law which we were under, as properly bearing the Curse thereof, and not only under a Mediatorial Law to procure a New one for us to obey for Justification. (2.) Did they own that Christ's Obedience, not our own Faith and Gospel-Works, takes the Place of what we were to have done under the Covenant of Works, which requir'd Perfect Obedience: And that his Obedience is the Matter and not

not only the *Meritorious Cause* of our Justification; even tho' they ascrib'd not a distinct Efficacy to the *Active Obedience*, but gave to the *Passive* what we give to both; there were more Reason to bear with them, than at Present there is; and their Scheme were much better than at present it stands. O that God by his Spirit might enlighten them thus far to amend it! For the *Path of the Just is as the shining Light that shineth more and more to the Perfect Day*, Prov. 4. 18. But when, according to their present Scheme, they bring the Obedience of Christ to so narrow a Compass as that of his *Sufferings and Death*, and that also to a somewhat instead of the *same*, or the very Curse of the Law for Sin, and then allow it no other *Use* in Justifying, than to procure that our *Imperfect Obedience* and good Works should justify us: This is to rob the Son of God of almost all his Glory, both as to the Obedience perform'd by Him, and the *USE* thereof as to us.

## F I N I S.

### A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

**T**HE Author when he wrote, knew not of Mr. Clark's Death.

### E R R A T A.

**P**Age vii. l. 24. r. *Women*. p. 12. l. 16. after *be* r. \* p. 30. l. 23. r. *than*. p. 35. l. 14. dele *and*. After *Is* f. it. l. 18. r. *answers*. p. 42. l. 26. r. *abasing*. p. 44. Mar. r. *Dr. Owen*, *ibid*. p. 45. l. 3 dele *as*. l. 19. for *I* r. *And*. p. 45. l. 9. r. *to*. l. 25. after *Himself* r. *and* must obey it for *Himself*. p. 47. l. 1. r. *Amesii*. l. 2. for *and* r. *S*. p. 54. l. 11. r. *if he had*. p. 58. l. 30. r. *penally*. p. 59. l. 14. r. *distinguishing*. p. 69. l. 32. for *r*. p. 72. l. 25. r. *Rom*. l. 16. 17. p. 91. l. 31. r. *affiliated*.

